COLLEGE
OF THE PACIFIC
GIFT OF
J. W. Mailliard, Jr.

MAZARIN

College of the Pacific
Stockton, Calif.

FRANCE UNDER MAZARIN

WITH A REVIEW OF THE

ADMINISTRATION OF RICHELIEU

BY

JAMES BRECK PERKINS

WITH PORTRAITS.

VOL. II.

THIRD EDITION.

NEW YORK & LONDON
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
The Knickerbocker Press
1887

COPYRIGHT BY
JAMES BRECK PERKINS
1886

88173
MAY 22'58
DC
123
P44
v.1-2

Press of
G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS
New York

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER XI.

PARLIAMENTARY FRONDE—1648–1650.

	PAGE
Prejudice against Mazarin	1
Complaints of the Parliament	2
Edict as to Loans	4
The Regent Leaves Paris	6
Beginning of Hostilities	8
Elbœuf Made General-in-Chief	10
He is Replaced by Conti	12
Madame de Longueville at the Hotel de Ville	13
Condition of Paris	15
Beaufort Returns	16
Accusations of Parliament against Mazarin	17
Insurgents Defeated at Charenton	18
Envoy of Spain Visits Parliament	20
Both Parties Weary of War	22
Negotiations at Ruel	23
Peace of Ruel	25
Opposition to its Acceptance	27
Demands of the Nobles	30
Terms Granted Them	33
The Treaty is Ratified	34
Troubles in the Provinces	35
Disturbances in Guienne	36
Ravages by the Soldiers	38
Position of Condé	39
Brawls at Paris	41
Defeat at Cambray	43
The Regent Returns to Paris	44
Mazarin brings his Nieces to France	46
Terms Imposed by Condé on the Government	49
Quarrels over the Tabouret	51
Troubles about the Rentes	52

PAGE

Pretended Attack on Joly 54
Assault on Condé 55
Retz and Beaufort Accused of this Attack 56
Overtures with Retz and Others 59
Affair of Jarzé 61
Marriage of Duke of Richelieu 62
Intrigues against Condé 63
Arrest of the Princes 64
Disgrace of Rivière 66

CHAPTER XII.

Revolts for the Release of Condé—1650–1651.

Madame de Longueville Goes to Normandy 67
Mazarin's Alliance with the Fronde 69
Disturbances in the Provinces 71
Condé's Wife Goes to Bordeaux 73
Insurrection There 74
Bordeaux Besieged 76
Épernon Removed 77
Terms of Peace Made 79
Spanish Invade France 82
Invasion Ended 84
Losses of the French in Italy 85
The Princes Removed to Havre 87
Discontent at Paris 88
Retz Demands to be Cardinal 89
Campaign in Champagne 92
Victory of Rethel 93
Alliance Proposed against Mazarin 94
Petitions for Condé's Release 96
Death of the Princess of Condé 97
Remonstrances of Parliament 99
Terms of the New Alliance 100
Orleans Attacks Mazarin 102
He Quarrels with the Regent 104
Mazarin Retires from Office 105
He Goes to St. Germain 106
Unhappy Condition of the Regent 108

CHAPTER XIII.

The Exile of Mazarin—1651.

The Princes Released by Mazarin 109
Power of Condé and Madame de Longueville 110

PAGE
Mazarin Ordered to Leave France 112
He Goes to Brühl 113
Demand for the States-General 114
Jealousy of the Parliament 116
Quarrel between Clergy and Parliament 118
Changes in the Ministry 120
Chateauneuf Loses his Office 121
Quarrels between the Frondeurs 122
The New Alliance Dissolved 124
Molé Removed from Office 125
Mazarin's Letters to the Queen 127
Retz Goes into Retirement 128
Intrigues against Condé 129
Condé Leaves Paris 130
His Demands upon the Regent 131
Intrigues for Mazarin's Return 133
Alliance between him and Retz 134
Proclamation against Condé 135
Quarrels between Retz and Condé 136
Majority of Louis XIV. 139
His Character 142

CHAPTER XIV.

Condé's Rebellion and Mazarin's Return—1651–1652.

Changes in the Ministry 144
Condé again in Rebellion 145
Alliance with the Spanish 147
Ill Success of Condé's Forces 150
Mazarin's Desire to Return 152
Conduct of Retz 154
Mazarin Marches to France 155
He Enters the Kingdom 156
His Library is Sold 158
Conduct of the Parliament 159
Mazarin Rejoins the Court 160
Intrigues of Retz at Rome 161
He is Made a Cardinal 168
Orleans Allies Himself with Condé 169
Condé Leaves Guienne 170
Death of Sirot 171
Character of Mademoiselle 172
She Rescues Orleans 173
Condé's Victory at Bleneau 175
He Goes to Paris 176

PAGE
Condition of that City 177
Intrigues for Peace 179
Disturbances at Paris 181
Capture of St. Denis 182
The Duke of Lorraine at Paris 184
Procession to St. Genevieve 186
Conduct of Beaufort 187
Attacks on the Judges 188
Battle of the Faubourg St. Antoine 189
Condé's Troops Admitted into Paris 193

CHAPTER XV.

The Close of the Fronde—1652–1653.

Massacre at the Hotel de Ville 195
Feeling against Condé 199
Orleans Made Lieutenant-General 200
Duel between Beaufort and Nemours 201
Parliament Summoned at Pontoise 202
Mazarin Retires from France 204
Edict of Amnesty 205
Ravages of the Soldiers near Paris 206
Parisians Desire Peace 207
Delegations Sent to the King 210
Condé and Lorraine Retire 211
The King Enters Paris 212
Orleans Sent to Blois 213
Edict Restricting Power of the Parliament 214
Intrigues of Retz 216
His Arrest 217
Results of the War during the Fronde 220
Loss of Dunkirk 222
Loss of Casal 224
Catalonia Subdued by the Spanish 225
Hostilities against Condé 226
Edicts Imposing New Taxes 227
Mazarin Returns to Paris 229
Dinner Given Him at the Hotel de Ville 230
Troubles in Guienne 232
Rebellion of Harcourt 233
The Ormée, at Bordeaux 234
Terms Granted Daugnon 238
Negotiations between England and Bordeaux 239
Plan for a Republic 241
Siege of Bordeaux 243
End of the Insurrection in Guienne 244

CHAPTER XVI.

War with Spain and Treaty with England—1653–1656.

PAGE

Hostilities between France and Spain 246
Arrest of Duke of Lorraine. Terms made with Harcourt . . . 248
Colbert's Management of Mazarin's Property 249
Marriage of Mazarin's Niece with Prince of Conti 252
Consecration of Louis XIV. 253
Sieges of Stenai and Arras 256
Capture of Stenai 257
Relief of Arras 258
Expedition against Naples 260
Conduct of Duke of Guise 260
Troubles with Retz 262
He Escapes from Prison 264
He Reaches Rome 266
Charges Made against Him 267
Death of Innocent X. 268
Election of Alexander VII. 270
Proceedings against Retz 271
Trouble with his Vicars at Paris 273
Lionne Recalled from Rome 276
Retz Leaves Rome 277
End of his Career 278
Imposition of a Stamp Duty 278
Treatment of the Parliament by Louis XIV. 279
Origin of the Saying "L'Etat, C'est moi" 280
The Parliament is Tranquilized 281
Campaign of 1655 282
Treason of Hocquincourt 283
Alliance with Duke of Modena 285
Negotiations with Cromwell 286
The Republic of England Recognized 289
Cromwell Delays in Making an Alliance 291
Charles II. Leaves France 294
Massacre of the Vaudois 295
Conduct of Cromwell 296
Treaty between France and England 297
Negotiations for Peace with Spain 299
Trouble with the Parliaments 300
Further Treaty between England and France 301

CHAPTER XVII.

Peace of the Pyrenees and Death of Mazarin—1657–1661.

Campaign of 1657 302
Complaints of Cromwell 303

PAGE

Capture of Mardyke 304
Battle of the Dunes 305
Success of the Allies 306
Christine of Sweden 307
Murder of Monaldeschi 310
Death of Ferdinand III. 311
Intrigues as to the Election of a New Emperor 312
Dealings of France with the Electors 313
Proceedings of the Congress 315
Election of Leopold I. 316
The League of the Rhine Formed 317
Negotiations for Marriage of Louis XIV. 318
Maria Theresa 319
Spanish Minister Visits Paris 320
The French Court at Lyons 321
Preliminary Treaty Made with Spain 322
Passion of Louis XIV. for Marie Mancini 323
Mazarin Discourages the Marriage 325
Mazarin and Haro Meet at Isle of Pheasants 326
Terms Granted Condé 328
Negotiations about England 330
Gramont Sent to Spain 331
Terms of the Peace of the Pyrenees 332
Marriage of Louis XIV. 334
Career of Fouquet 335
Financial System 336
Frauds and Extravagance of Fouquet 338
Plots Formed by Him 341
His Overthrow 343
Influence of France in Europe 344
Terms Granted Lorraine 346
Illness of Mazarin 347
His Death 348
His Fortune 348
Careers of the Nieces of Mazarin 350

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE.

Nature of the French Government 357
Secretaries and Superintendent of Finance 358
Frauds in the Finances 360
Condition of the Army 362
Condition of the Navy 364
Internal Duties on Goods 366
Differences in Prices 366

PAGE
Condition of Manufactures 367
Ravages of Pirates 368
Trading Companies 369
Highways 370
Relative Value of Money 371
The Taille 372
Weight of this Tax 373
The Taille in the Pays d'Etats 374
The Gabelle 376
Other Indirect Taxes 379
Cost of Collecting Taxes 380
Sales of Offices 381
Amount of Rentes 382
Population of France 383
Population of Paris 384
Wages 385
Price of Wheat 387
Condition of Agriculture 389
Prices of Meat and Other Articles 390
Relative Condition of the People 391
Ignorance Among the People 392
Overflows of Rivers 393
Debts of the Towns 394
Violence Practised by Nobles 395
Misery of the People 396
Ravages at Laon and Marle During the Wars 397
Sufferings in other Provinces 403
Fall in Rents 408
Decrease in Population during the Fronde 409
Comparative Condition of the French Peasants To-day and Then . 410

CHAPTER XIX.

Social Life and Customs.

Numbers of the Nobility 411
Comparative Expenses of Living 412
Incomes of the Nobility 413
Their Extravagance 414
Cost of Dress 415
Dress of Ladies 416
Hunting 417
Gambling 418
Dueling 419
Quarrels for Precedence 420
Education among the Upper Classes 421
Influence and Condition of the Nobility 422

PAGE

Prices of Various Offices 424
Corruption among Holders of Political Office 425
Influences Exerted upon Judges 427
Nobility of the Robe 428
Incomes of Lawyers and Doctors 429
Hours of Rising and of Meals 429
Luxuries of the Table 430
Wine-Shops and Drinking 432
Italian Opera 433
Comedies 434
Theatres 435
French Academy 436
Libraries and Laws of the Press 437
Newspapers 438
Building in Paris 440
Palace of Mazarin 442
Library Collected by Him 443
Price of Land and Rate of Interest 444
Improvements in Paris 445
Cabs and Carriages 446
Bad Condition of Streets 447
Robbers in Paris 448
Bridges in Paris 449
Robbers in the Country 450
Time Required for Travel 451
Mails and Rates of Postage 452
Jardin des Plantes 453
Punishment of Criminals 454
Customs as to Marriages 455
Superstitions 456
Prosecutions for Witchcraft 458
Condition of the Jews 459
Literature under Richelieu and Mazarin 460
Hotel Rambouillet 462
Malherbe and Balzac 463
Voiture and Scudery 464
Influence of the Port Royal 465
Descartes 466
Corneille and Moliere 467
Letter and Memoir Writing 468

CHAPTER XX.

The Port Royal.

Condition of the Gallican Church 469
Saint Vincent de Paul 470

PAGE

Monastery of the Port Royal 471
Its Reformation by Mother Angelique 472
Saint Francis of Sales 473
Saint Cyran and Jansenius 475
Publication of the Augustinus 477
The Five Propositions 478
The Port Royal Defends Jansenius 479
Arnauld's "Frequent Communion" 480
The Recluses of the Port Royal 481
The Little Schools of the Port Royal 483
Pascal 484
Position of the Jesuits 485
The Provincial Letters 486
Their Influence 489
Miracles at the Port Royal 490
Persecutions of the Port Royal 491
Dissolution of the Monastery 492

FRANCE UNDER RICHELIEU AND MAZARIN.

CHAPTER XI.

THE PARLIAMENTARY FRONDE.

THE treaty of Westphalia, which brought religious peace to Europe and carried France to the Rhine, was hardly noticed in that kingdom. Few of the chroniclers of that time even mention it. By many of the pamphleteers of the Fronde, this treaty was added to the endless list of Mazarin's crimes. A Mazarinade of 1649 said that the minister wore the purple of the church only to show the bloody stabs he had inflicted on it in Germany; no one could read the treaty, made in favor of the Swedes and Protestants and to the prejudice of the Catholic faith, and believe that it was devised by any one but a Turk or a Saracen disguised under the cloak of a cardinal.[1]

Mazarin's great achievements in foreign affairs were obscured both by the din of faction, and by the tortuous and ignoble qualities of his own character. By a strange fortune, among a people most easily dazzled by success in war and by territorial gains, the man under whom Alsace, Roussillon, and much of Artois were added to France, was, of all her ministers, most hated when alive, and has obtained but a scanty popularity with posterity.

Not only did Mazarin gain nothing by the triumphant end of the German war, but the concession of the edict of

[1] Choix des Mazarinades, vol. i., pp. 99, 100.

October 22d was equally ineffectual in insuring peace for his administration. On the 12th of November the Parliament again assembled, but it was soon seen that the discontents had not been allayed by the vacation.[1] The judges returned from the quiet of their country seats ready for tumultuous debates and fierce denunciations of the cardinal. Many of the provisions of the edict of October had been distasteful to the government, and they were enforced with the irregularity of reluctance.

Complaints were soon made of failures to comply with its regulations. Fourteen or fifteen millions had been raised since La Meilleraie had charge of the finances, but the soldiers had received no pay, the officials no wages, and the rentiers no interest.

It was the intention of the queen, said Orleans and Condé in her behalf, to execute the declaration in good faith, and if there had been any violation of it she desired to be informed, that it might be remedied; but if pretexts were sought to prevent raising the necessary supplies, and if it was endeavored, under the pretence of seeking the public good, to raise obstacles to the government, they would be the first to advise her to seek the necessary means for preserving the state and the royal authority.[2]

There were many who were quite ready to obstruct the government, and who were not to be deterred even by the threats of the prince of Condé. The public denunciations of Mazarin became more bitter, and some libels that were published were so fierce that, tolerant as the cardinal was of public abuse, he had the printer of one of them arrested and banished.[3]

He could not be wholly indifferent to such attacks or to the countless abusive pamphlets, which, under the name of Mazarinades, furnished the chief literature of Paris. "It is hard," he wrote to Servien, "to be exposed as I am to the malice of those who circulate reports so

[1] Talon, 306. Dis. Ven., cviii., 154, *et passim.*

[2] Journal du Parlement, 106–108. Talon, 311, 312. Dis. Ven., cviii , 160.

[3] Talon, 313.

false, that a man of any sense or affection for the state detests them. I need an extra zeal to labor for a public which treats me so ill at a time when, without vanity, I could say it has received some fruit from my labors. I watch night and day for the quiet of the kingdom, and the advantage of the poorest subject, without thought of myself. I not only have no money, but the most of my silver and jewels are in pawn, and if I should have to leave the kingdom, I should not have the means with which to make the journey." [1]

Mazarin perhaps exaggerated his poverty, but his great fortune was not accumulated until after the Fronde. Before that he had received liberally, but he had expended lavishly, and his finances during the Fronde were in almost as much confusion as those of the government. Mazarin claimed the credit also for having induced the queen to return to Paris, and said that he hoped now for continued harmony.[2]

The cardinal was universally thought responsible because the negotiations with Spain had ceased, and the war with that nation still continued. He gained no popular favor because he had obtained an honorable peace from Germany, but he was fiercely attacked because he failed in obtaining peace with Spain. The enormous wealth of the farmers of taxes and financiers seemed more conspicuous and more odious in a time of general misery, and the hatred felt towards them, was felt also towards him who allowed their practices and their gains. Even the receipts from the taille had been farmed, a thing contrary to custom and denounced by the Court of Aids.[3]

"It was," says a lady of the Court, "the fashion to hate

[1] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 220–224., Oct. 30, 1648.

[2] *Ibid.*, 220. It is necessary at some times to have Mazarin's Carnets as well as his letters, to know what his views really were. The Carnet which has been quoted does not agree with the tone of this letter, though this was written to one of his most trusted political agents. In a letter to the Princess of Orange in August, 1648, he recommends the bailli of Souvré to her, and says that the bailli is one of his intimate friends. An entry in his Carnets not long before gives his real views: "Souvré is a rogue, and every day I know it more."—Carnet viii., 4.

[3] Journal du Parlement, 107.

Mazarin," and the fashion spread from the Palais Royal to the Faubourg St. Antoine.

The courtier must profess a hatred of Mazarin as well as observe the last fashion in ruffles. The huckster abused the cardinal as he sold his wares and thought of his taxes; his confusion was drunk in the taverns by the men who there wasted their wages or the money they had stolen, and even the gamin vending the last pamphlet along the Pont Neuf cried, "No Mazarin!"

A new regulation was issued in reference to the payment of interest, and it was one entirely proper and necessary; but it was used to foster discontents by the enemies of the government, some of whom acted from ignorance and some from malice. The payment of interest on loans had been made by *acquits à comptant*, and thus concealed from any public scrutiny. But the declaration of October had limited such acquits to three millions, and it was impossible that the large payments of interest should longer be made in this manner. Loans were necessary for the government, and an edict was published regulating them, and authorizing the payment of interest at ten per cent. The rate was high, but the credit of the government was so poor that it could expect no better terms, and it rarely obtained as good. The measure was one, however, which, even if required, could easily be made odious, and it was seized upon by Retz for that purpose. To the coadjutor, the growing political complications furnished an opportunity for putting into practice the maxims of the conspiracy of Fiesque, and of posing as a follower of Catiline.

A personal disappointment stimulated his love for plotting and intrigue. He had been allured by the prospect of being appointed governor of Paris, and he confesses that the baton crossed by the crucifix had seemed to him a most agreeable figure.[1]

But this hope had been disappointed, and he now dreamed of becoming the ruler of Paris in insurrection.

[1] Retz, 202. Mazarin, in his Carnets, speaks of Retz's intrigues for this place. Also in Lettres, iii., 267.

An edict, which authorized the payment of high rates of interest on money lent to the state, could well be used to excite the passions of the inhabitants of the city. Usury was condemned by Holy Writ, and the profits of the lenders to the government were odious to the people. Retz sought the opinion of the doctors of the Sorbonne upon this matter, and they decided that to loan money at ten per cent., or any other rate, was usury, a mortal sin, and a thing which could not be authorized, even by the consent of the Parliament.[1]

Thereupon Retz instructed his curés and canons to denounce from their pulpits an edict which sought openly to authorize what was condemned by the law of God, and to lift up their voices against this legalization of usury. Parishioners heard from their priests the condemnation of this defiance of religion, which all knew had been devised by the greedy and impious Mazarin. In eight days Retz boasted that he caused the cardinal to be regarded as the worst Shylock there was in Europe.[2] The offending edict was withdrawn, but the regent and her ministers resolved to check these constant encroachments upon their authority.

Some advocated using the Arsenal and Bastille as centres of military operations, and coercing the Parliament into obedience.[3] But Mazarin favored rather retiring again from the city, and by cutting off its supplies, starving it into discontent with the Parliament and into submission to the king. The preparations for leaving Paris were made with great secrecy.[4] The queen was always an adept at deceit, and on the evening of January 5, 1649,

[1] Journal de Debuisson-Aubenay Mss., December 30, 1648.

[2] Retz, 225. It is unnecessary to remark that Retz says "Jew," not Shylock. To him, as to almost every Frenchman of that time, the works, and probably the name, of Shakespeare were unknown. See also Carnets, xi., 17.

[3] Aff. Etr. France 123, 124.

[4] But the Venetian minister, writing January 5th, says that Mazarin was of the opinion it was best for the Court to leave Paris and mortify both the people and the Parliament, cviii., 174. He says that Mazarin proposed retiring on account of the hostility felt to him, but the queen said this would be most injurious to the interests of her son,—178.

she jested with her ladies-in-waiting, and seemed free from care, and in exceptionally good spirits. She watched the young king playing, joined in some sports with her attendants, and said she must pass the next day in devotions at Val de Grace. A little after midnight she retired, but she shortly arose and prepared for flight. At three, Louis and his brother were taken from their beds, and, with a few attendants, they all went down the back staircase from the queen's apartments into the garden; there carriages were waiting, and they were immediately driven away. At the rendezvous they were joined by Orleans, Condé and Mazarin, and a few to whom the secret had been entrusted. Anne preferred a vigorous policy against the upstarts of the Parliament, instead of the concessions to which her ministers had forced her to agree, and now that resort was to be had to force, she was as gay as if she had won a battle, captured Paris, and hung all those who displeased her.[1]

They all drove to St. Germain. This was a summer palace, and in winter it was stripped of its furniture and conveniences. The secrecy of the plans had not allowed any preparation to make it habitable. There were no beds, no linen, and no silver. The queen slept on a couch that Mazarin had sent. The most of the company were glad to find even straw to rest upon, and the demand for it was such that it furnished a profitable speculation for the few who had any to sell. Mademoiselle of Orleans tells us that she slept in a chamber richly painted and decorated, but with windows without glass, which she found unpleasant in January.[2]

There was universal consternation in the city on the morning of the 6th, when the news spread that the king, the regent, and the chief officers of the state had fled from Paris. Such a movement, it was said, would be the prelude of troubles far more serious than the barricades of the past summer. There had been complaints for some time that

[1] Montpensier, 50. Journal du Parlement, January 6, 1649. Dis. Ven., cviii., 182. [2] Montpensier, 51. Motteville, 230–232.

the troops were gathering about Paris, and it had been feared that some hostile measure was contemplated. This had now become only too plain. The city was to be starved into subjection, the Parliament was to be humbled, and the odious rule of Mazarin was to be permanently established.

The prospect was alarming, and it seemed the more so because this flight had been so sudden and unexpected. A population estimated at 900,000 had to be fed; troops must be raised for defence and to keep open the roads for supplies, and the organization and control of a great city in a state of siege was suddenly thrown upon the Parliament and the Hotel de Ville.[1]

The retreat to St. Germain was at once followed by endeavors to alienate Paris from the Parliament. This had been the hope of the regent and the plan of the cardinal. A proclamation was sent to tbe authorities at the Hotel de Ville, declaring that the perfidious designs of some members of the Parliament, who were in relations with the enemies of the state and had even plotted to seize the royal person, had forced the king to leave Paris, but from the bourgeois and citizens of the town he hoped continued affection and good service.[2] On the 7th, a message was brought to the Parliament by a lieutenant of the guards, commanding it to retire to Montargis and there hold its further sessions. The officers of the city were informed that so soon as the rebellious Parliament had obeyed her orders, the queen would return to Paris, provisions would be abundant, and commerce be reëstablished. If the Parliament went out of one gate, the king would come in by the other.[3]

In the meantime, those members of the Parliament who refused obedience were declared guilty of high treason, and orders were issued forbidding the country people to sell their cattle to the Paris butchers.[4] It was

[1] Journal d' Ormesson, i., 610. Ormesson gives these figures. The actual population of the city was much less than 900,000.

[2] Reg. de l' Hotel de Ville, 62–4. Motteville, 233. Molé, iii., 313. Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 249–251.

[3] Reg. Hotel de Ville i., 70–82.

[4] Reg. de l'Hotel de Ville, vol. i., 89, 91. Talon, 320.

hard, Mazarin wrote, thus to be obliged to employ the arms of France against Frenchmen, and to risk losing the advantages of a long war in which that kingdom had regained its ancient boundaries on the Rhine, and was on the eve of an advantageous peace with Spain.[1]

But the spirit of resistance was strong, and the city authorities and the members of the courts were ready to unite in the common defence. Such a feeling was fostered by a few discontented nobles, who saw in this commotion an opportunity for gaining for themselves positions or governments. The lower classes of the city were always ready for any popular ferment, and among them agitation was easily excited, either by praise of the magistrates who were attacked in their efforts for the public good, or by abuse of Mazarin, who was prosecuting his plans for the public injury.

The Fronde had thus reached the stage of open war. The government was resolved to crush the opposition of the Parliament, and to coerce the city of Paris, if it continued in sympathy with the Parliament. The resistance to the regent, on the other hand, was based upon the endeavor of the courts to exercise a control which the public believed would be for the general welfare. The financial disorders and the burdens of taxation had affected the bourgeois and even the artisans of Paris, and in most of the provinces there was widespread misery. The efforts of the judges were, therefore, supported by the hopes and the sympathy of a large element of the population. Burdensome taxation and general distress were found at the beginning of the Fronde as at the beginning of the Revolution, but in less degree and in a different condition of public feeling. One hundred and fifty years later, misery had increased and loyalty had diminished; the burden was greater, the love for the king was less.

Even an injudicious endeavor to change a system of government much in need of amendment, gave a certain dignity to the early phases of the Fronde. The movement was

[1] Lettres, iii., 251, Jan'y 15, 1649.

soon to fall into the hands of the Condés, the Retzes, and the Bouillons, and to become only a mercenary burlesque on the former struggles of the great nobles for local independence. Nothing but the picturesqueness of the actors then relieves the insignificance of the action.

The Parliament and the city officers met the royal proclamation with energy. On the pretext that it was not sent by the proper channel, the Parliament declined to receive the edict which ordered it to retire to Montargis. It answered the king's justification of his retreat by desiring the names of any of its members who had plotted against the royal safety, that if found guilty they might be punished, while if innocent, those who accused them might be condemned as calumniators.[1]

After a tumultuous debate it was voted that the Cardinal Mazarin, as the author of all these disturbances, should be asked to leave the Court within twenty-four hours, and France within eight days, and that troops should be raised in sufficient numbers to provide for the food and safety of Paris.[2]

An army of about 12,000 men was organized.[3] The indefatigable coadjutor furnished a regiment of cavalry at his own expense, which, from his titular archbishopric of Corinth, was dubbed the regiment of Corinthians. The warlike prelate did not escape ridicule, and when, at its first encounter, the regiment suffered defeat, the combat was called the first of Corinthians.

A war tax was voted twice as large as had been imposed during the panic in 1636, when the Spaniards were at Corbie. One million livres were to be furnished by the different sections of Parliament. The counsellors created by Richelieu had been practically ostracized by the body, and their offices rendered of little value. No suits were

[1] Ormesson, i., 605.

[2] Ormesson, 612. Journal du Parlement, 113–118.

[3] Ten sous a day was to be paid to foot-soldiers and forty sous a day to horsemen, payment to be made every Saturday. Journal d' Aubenay, January 11, 1649. Journal du Parlement, 126. The wages were above those usually paid, but the price of provisions was high.

given them for examination, their opinions were hardly asked at public audiences, and the places for which they had paid largely could only be sold at a great sacrifice. They now offered to pay 300,000 livres for the cause, and at this cost they received full recognition and their legitimate opportunities for earning legal fees in the future.[1]

A general was needed for the troops now to be raised, but of willing generals there was no lack. There was rather a race to see who could first profess his zeal for the cause of the people. The Duke of Elbœuf was one of the adventurous House of Lorraine, and the kinsman of the Duke of Guise, who had lately headed the revolution at Naples. Elbœuf was ambitious and poor, and he now saw his opportunity; he professed his regret that he had not more blood in his body that he might spill the last drop of it, serving the Parliament for the good of the state.[2]

He was received with applause at the Hotel de Ville, and proclaimed general-in-chief. Although the Parliament complained that a general had been selected without first consulting it as the chief body in the state, it ratified this choice.[3]

But Retz had secured still more dignified allies, and Elbœuf soon lost his precedence. Condé's younger brother, the Prince of Conti, had long fluctuated between the church and the army. During the last autumn it had been decided in the family councils that the family interests would be most advanced by his espousal of religion. Accordingly the nomination of the Abbé de la Rivière for the cardinalate had been revoked, and the name of Conti substituted.[4] Both Rivière and his master, Orleans, were

[1] Talon, 321. Ormesson, 614. Journal du Parlement, 118.

[2] Ormesson, 619. [3] Reg. Hotel de Ville, i., 103–111.

[4] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 10, 811. The minister was instructed, however, to obtain Conti's nomination as extraordinary, and to preserve the ordinary nomination for Rivière. The Venetian ambassador said this would not do the Abbé much good, as the Pope would not be apt to appoint two cardinals from a nation that was not especially friendly.—Dis. Ven., cviii., 120, 121. The Pope did not appoint either of them.

greatly incensed by this blow to the Abbé's ambition, but it was useless to contend with the advantages Conti derived from his superior rank. The prince was, however, only a weak boy, and he was turned from his plans of ecclesiastical ambition by his only strong passion, his love for his sister, Mme. de Longueville.[1] This passionate affection seemed to exceed the love of brother for sister.[2]

It gave to Mme. de Longueville the absolute control over a prince whose rank made him important, and this control she now began to exercise. She had quarrelled with Condé, and she was drawn to plans of ambition by her love for Rochefoucauld, who had become the confessed master of her fate. Nothing in the maxims of the great satirist is more cynical than his description of the beginning of this intrigue. Mme. de Longueville, in 1646, was not only the most beautiful woman in France, but she then possessed a great influence over Condé. Many had sighed for her, but in vain, and the present suitor was Cæsar Phœbus, Count of Miossens. "I had reason to believe," says Rochefoucauld, "that I could make more use of the friendship and confidence of Mme. de Longueville. Miossens agreed to this. He knew my relations at Court, and I told him my views." Miossens yielded the place he had not won, and Rochefoucauld, who was then called the Prince of Marcillac, and in whom the fire of youth concealed the cynicism of the satirist, soon gained the complete devotion of his lady-love.[3] "In all she has done since," writes a lady of the Court, "one could plainly see that it was not ambition alone that filled her soul, but that the interests of the Prince of Marcillac there held a great place. For him she became ambitious; for him she ceased to love repose, and, absorbed by her affection, she forgot her own good name."[4]

Three years had passed, and had only strengthened this affection. Mme. de Longueville's relations with her husband were still those of nominal amity, either because he

[1] Retz, i., 218–219. Molé, iii., 327.
[2] Retz, 219.
[3] Rochefoucauld, 94–96.
[4] Motteville, 120.

was not fully informed of her conduct, or because his own adventures forbade his being argus-eyed. Both Rochefoucauld and Longueville were discontented with the regent and with Mazarin. Mme. de Longueville was ready to accompany her lover in civil war, or to the field of battle, and Conti was happy to go where his sister led. On January 10th, Conti and Longueville presented themselves at the gate of St. Honoré, to join the popular cause. Their relations with Condé made the people distrust these would-be allies, and not until Retz and Broussel gave assurance of their fidelity, were they allowed to enter and proceed to the Parliament.[1]

Elbœuf said he would surrender only with his life the command-in-chief, which he had obtained by his greater celerity. But he was driven to yield, and on the 11th of January, the Prince of Conti, a youth in years, deformed in body, and feeble in mind, was proclaimed generalissimo of the armies of the king, under the orders of the Parliament, with Elbœuf, Bouillon, and De la Mothe Houdancourt as generals under him.[2]

Bouillon brought to the cause the hereditary ability of the house of De la Tour, sharpened by years of resentment that Sedan, torn from him by Richelieu, had never been restored. Though crippled by disease, he was still the ablest of the noble auxiliaries. It was hoped, also, that his influence would secure for the cause his brother Turenne, who had under his command a victorious and devoted army.[3]

Houdancourt had been disgraced and imprisoned for his ill success in Catalonia, and possessed an ill-founded popularity as a victim of Mazarin. He was a man below mediocrity, who combined incapacity with sullenness.

On the same day the new auxiliaries gave valuable hostages for their fidelity. Mme de Longueville and her step-daughter drove to the Hotel de Ville and entered the

[1] Journal du Parlement, 119.

[2] Ormesson, 620–5, Journal du Parlement, 115–124. Dis. Ven., 182–8. Retz, i., 240–50. Talon, 321, 322. Molé, iii., 328–335.

[3] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 266.

grand hall. The Duke of Longueville told the aldermen and the provost that, having no dearer pledges, he had brought these to answer for his fidelity, and they prayed for shelter. The city fathers, not undisturbed at the prospect of such guests, answered that they doubted not the good-will of M. de Longueville, but the Hotel de Ville furnished scanty quarters for persons of their quality.[1] There, however, they were lodged, and Mme. de Longueville took an active part in the consultations of the leaders of the Fronde. Her son, whom the evil-minded declared of uncertain parentage, was born at the Hotel de Ville, held at the font by the officers of the city, and baptized Charles Paris. This child of the Fronde had hardly attained manhood when he fell in his country's battles by the shores of the Rhine, and caused tears which literature has made immortal. Even childbirth hardly interrupted the political zeal of one who had heretofore been as well known for her gentle languor, as for her unequalled beauty. Mme. de Bouillon also assisted at these counsels, and the two ladies, each beautiful and each bearing an infant in her arms, drove through the Grève, so crowded that the very roofs were covered with people, the men shouting their applause at beauty combined with patriotism and courage, while the women wept for tenderness.

The Hotel de Ville presented a mixture of cuirasses and ladies' scarfs, violins and trumpets, such as were more often seen in romances than in real life.[2]

The Duke of Longueville retired into Normandy, and through his influence the Parliament of that great province resolved upon union with the Fronde of Paris. The initiative of Paris was followed in many of the provinces. Local troubles and the creation of new judges and semestres were the matters complained of by the various courts. The Parliament of Provence declared its union. Rheims, Poitiers, and other places, led either by the local authori-

[1] Reg. d'Hotel de Ville, i., 115.

[2] Retz, i., 249. Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 266–8. Lettres de Patin, 412. Journal du Parlement, 154–6.

ties or the neighboring noblemen, took up arms in behalf of the Fronde. The Parliaments of Toulouse and Bordeaux were preparing to join the cause.[1] It was hoped to gain Orleans and some planned to take the regency from Anne and choose Gaston in her place.[2] Such a measure would have been revolutionary, and it was too violent a step to be attempted by the Parliament.

Hostilities were confined to Paris, nor even there were they prosecuted with much vigor. The regent had been disappointed in her hopes of terrifying the city into subjection, and she now proceeded with her plans to cut off its supplies. It was believed that the mechanic with no bread, or the shopkeeper with a scanty dinner of stale vegetables, would soon weary of the rule of legal pedants, and would tell the judges to go about their law cases and allow plenty and quiet again to reign. The people would come to ask pardon with the halter around their necks, when for three days, they found no bread of Gonesse at the market.[3] The government resolved on the step of summoning the States-General to meet at Orleans on March 15th. It was thought a good device to prevent harm resulting from the present disturbances.[4] But neither party desired a meeting of the States and the session was not held.

Occasional skirmishes took place between the forces commanded by Orleans and Condé and the troops raised by the Fronde. None, however, were of much importance. Though the advantage of arms was rather with

[1] Ormesson, i., 645. Reg. de l'Hotel de Ville, i., 344, 377, 385, 399. Journal du Parlement, 129, 137, 163, etc. Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 278, 284, etc., upon the events in Normandy.

[2] Dis. Ven., cviii., 188.

[3] Ormesson, 653. Retz, i., 270. Brienne says Tellier allowed six months to starve Paris into subjection. Mém. de Brienne, 105, 106. Gonesse was a town near Paris where the best bread was made.

[4] Brienne to Fontenay, Jan. 15, 1649. Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 268. Dis. Ven., cviii., 188. Mazarin, in his letter, says the States were to be called to meet at Rouen, but this is a mistake. The royal proclamation shows they were called for Orleans. Following Mazarin's letter, M. Cheruel says they were to be held at Rouen.—t. iii., 158.

the Cardinalists, as the Frondeurs called their adversaries, supplies reached Paris in tolerable abundance. The forces of the regent were not sufficient to reduce the city to a condition of actual siege, and while supplies from some quarters were cut off, from other directions they arrived with but little interruption. Wheat sold at a dollar and a quarter a bushel. The bread furnished the soldiers was required to be between white and black, composed of two thirds of wheat and one third of rye, and its price was not immoderate.[1]

In the early part of February the condition of Paris was said to be admirable. Bread was good; though its price was variable and at times high, there was no disturbance; the workmen were at their tasks, and every one was attending to his own affairs. There were no marks of a siege except at the churches, where every one prayed God very devoutly.[2] An unprecedented overflow of the Seine excited the city without doing serious harm. One could go in the Rue St. Antoine only by boat, and the waters covered the island and the Faubourg St. Germain. There had not been such an overflow since 1576.[3]

Tranquility was not, however, so complete that the Parliament found no embarrassment in its rôle of a legislative and executive body. Every morning, not excepting fête days and Sundays all the chambers assembled, and, with the princes and generals, discussed public affairs. Two or three times a week they met to superintend the distribution of bread on market days. Some of the judges were charged with preventing disorder and restraining the populace, and

[1] Reg. d'Hotel de Ville, i., 192. Journal d'Aubenay, Jan. 13th. Ormesson, 631. Lenet, 519. Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 280–2, Jan. 28th.

[2] Ormesson, i., 647. Lettres de Patin, 403–411. Journal du Parlement, *passim*. Molé, however, says that labor ceased among the artisans and traffic and commerce among the merchants. Mémoires, iii., 320. But to a man reverencing the ordinary routine of government and inclined to friendship with the regency, any interruption of legal forms seemed a lamentable revolution. With equal tenacity for legal forms, the Parliament, Retz said, insisted on technical defects in the performance of the edict of October, in the same manner as if they were irregularities in a foreclosure.

[3] Ormesson, i., 631. Journal d'Aubenay. Les Inondations de France.

in this they were assisted by the city magistrates and the bourgeois.[1] The Bastille had been captured at once. It made, indeed, but a formal resistance. A few rounds were discharged at it from three pieces of cannon. The women carried their chairs into the garden of the arsenal, knit their stockings, and watched the bombardment.[2] Its governor surrendered the keys, and Broussel was appointed in his place.[3]

Beaufort appeared in Paris and demanded a vindication from the charges that had so long hung over him. He rode through the streets of the city, beautiful in his aureole of golden hair, and accompanied by the coadjutor sounding his praises. Men cheered him and women kissed him. Parliament at once considered his case, and declared him triumphantly acquitted, with leave to proceed for damages against his accusers.[4]

The torrent of pasquinades was more abundant than ever, and even the Parliament endeavored to put some check upon them. The regent suffered as well as Mazarin, and broad hints were thrown out as to the relations of the cardinal with Madame Anne, as the queen was nicknamed by the common people. No terms of vituperation were spared in the assaults upon the cardinal. He was the person whom all the world knew to be the disturber of public repose; the enemy and ruin of all France; one million souls had perished in the disorders and wars he had kindled in Europe. And who was the man who had done this untold evil? His arms were hatchets and a bundle of rods, but they were not those of the Roman senators, but the hatchets with which his grandfather chopped wood and the whips with which his father whipped the horses.

Sprung from the dregs of the people, a subject of Spain, within six years he had mounted on the shoulders

[1] Talon, 328; Molé, iii., 320.

[2] Retz, i., 266. Journal d'Aubenay, January 13th.

[3] Journal du Parlement, 126.

[4] Journal du Parlement, 126–8. Retz, i., 267. Talon, 322. Lettres de Patin, 415.

of the king of France. Stealing untold millions, he had wasted them in unheard-of sensuality. He had spent three years in concocting pomades to whiten his hands; he had invented a new drink of which the cost was beyond conception; his name was perpetuated, not by admiring cities named after him, but by pasties and ragouts. Since he had been minister, ballets, comedies, and buffoons so filled the palace that it seemed as if the whole state had been bitten by a tarantula.[1]

The leaders and warriors of the Fronde did not escape ridicule. Pasquinades represented Captain Picard composing a company himself, with no soldiers; Beaufort covered with a cock's feathers; the bourgeois Monsieur "Somebody," with immense ears, posing at his counter as a statesman. In one of them the colonel says, we have ordered all our soldiers to carry boot-tops, lest the brooks formed by the blood of those we shall slay should flow over the tops of their shoes.

On the 21st of January the Parliament adopted, for submission to the king, a labored justification of its action. It consisted chiefly of a long attack upon the cardinal, which, in virulence, was hardly exceeded by the most bitter Mazarinade. Two notable examples, it said, the Marshal Ancre and the Cardinal Richelieu, had shown how the elevation of a subject had made him formidable to the king, and intolerable to the people. But the queen, like many of the good, having too little mistrust of the wicked, had allowed Mazarin to succeed to Richelieu's plans and designs. He conferred all favors, ordered all punishments, and bestowed all offices. He left to the regent none of the gratitude of the fortunate, but only the ill-will of the disappointed. Under him the true interests of the State had been abandoned; peace had been delayed, the finances exhausted, and the people ruined. Who could not see that he had prevented peace in order to render himself more necessary, and to raise greater sums

[1] Choix des Mazarinades, vol. i., 94, 95, 99, 156, and see the vast number of similar pamphlets at the Bibliothèque Nationale.

for his own enrichment? Such a man was the Cardinal Mazarin, who had so pillaged the kingdom that there were few persons in it to whom a bed was left; fewer who had bread to eat, and none at all who could live without scrimping and discomfort. He hated the Parliament because it sought to relieve the misery of the subjects and to improve the revenues of the king, and he had resolved to involve Paris and the Parliament in one common ruin. They had taken up arms, not for their own safety, but for the protection of the king and of the kingdom; a thing which should therefore be regarded, not as an act of rebellion, but as a performance of duty.[1]

Such accusations were undoubtedly believed by many of the Parliament and by most of the populace; but while the nation had suffered some evil from Mazarin's errors, and from the disorders which his financial incapacity had allowed to increase, there was little justification for such sweeping abuse. He justly claimed that he had rendered great service to the state. Even if he was not justified in his assertion that he had taken nothing for himself or his relatives, there is no doubt that he felt his conduct had been disinterested. In his private notes he said that he would gladly account for all his transactions with the state, and they would show a disinterestedness that was without example.[2]

Even though fair order was preserved in Paris, the strain of war was felt. On the 8th of February the army of the city suffered a defeat at Charenton, and that place was captured by Condé. The engagement was unimportant, but Charenton was one of the few remaining places of supply.[3] The citizens gathered near the Port St. Antoine, discussing with amazement the news brought by the returning troops, and accusing Elbœuf and the other generals of treachery. Large bodies of the bourgeois pa-

[1] Talon, 322–328; Journal du Parlement, 138–146.

[2] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 277, January 22d. Carnet, x., 95.

[3] Mazarin recognized the importance of this place. In Carnet, xi., 69, he writes: "Prendre sans delai Charenton et la garder y établissant un quartier," etc.

trolled the streets, and the coadjutor pleased himself and displeased many of his parishioners, by riding through them with a gray habit over his gown, and a brace of pistols at his belt.[1]

Elbœuf complained that his troops were so poorly paid that few were ready for service, but it was replied that the troops on the rolls were all paid, and if they did not receive their money it was from the frauds of the captains, who reported and received pay for fifty men when they had not over a dozen under their command. The faint-hearted said after this reverse that it was better to think of making terms now than to wait until they were reduced to extremities, and discontent in the city began to show itself.[2] But Charenton was not held by the king's troops, and the roads remained open for supplies.[3]

There was trouble, however, in raising money. On the tenth of February the Parliament passed a resolution imposing taxes to be paid monthly by the bourgeois for the support of the army. Many protested against this edict. The tax on some persons of considerable means amounted to one or two thousand livres. It was said that every one would let his furniture be sold rather than pay such impositions, and the Parliament would not dare to order forced sales for the collection of taxes, lest it should run the hazard of exciting pillage.[4]

To supply these financial deficits, resort was had to confiscation. Money or property belonging to Mazarin or his partisans was confiscated, and the rewards offered to spies led to a constant supply of informations. Private houses, even churches and graveyards, were searched.[5] The furniture of Mazarin was seized and sold, and the

[1] Ormesson, i., 655, 656.

[2] Dis. Ven., cviii., 206–208, Feb. 12th.

[3] Ormesson, 657. Talon, 331. Journal du Parlement, 179–184.

[4] Ormesson, 641, 657. Journal du Parlement, 182.

[5] Joly says, p. 19, one third was given to informers, and the Venetian Minister says one fifth, t. cviii., 203. Talon, who is more correct in such matters, tells us they received but one tenth. Talon, 329. For these confiscations see Journal du Parlement, *passim*. Ormesson, 657, 658.

Parliament discussed the dispersion of his great library. An inventory was made that the sale might proceed at once if so ordered. Such vandalism, though defeated for the present, was unfortunately only delayed.[1]

While the Parliament was struggling with these difficulties, the generals and nobles associated with it were plotting to obtain the aid of Spain. The Spaniards were now relieved from the fear of being speedily forced to an inglorious peace, and they were eager to assist an insurrection in France. An envoy from the Archduke Leopold, the viceroy of the Low Countries, visited Paris with offers of aid. Treating with the open enemies of France was a perilous negotiation, and the generals desired that the Parliament should become a party to it. So dangerous a remedy, it was said, would certainly be fatal unless it passed through the alembic of the Parliament.[2]

Only a few days before the herald of the king of France, dressed in his coat of violet velvet, and carrying his baton ornamented with fleurs-de-lys, had asked for entrance into Paris, as the bearer of messages from Louis of France to the Parliament. It was difficult for those who professed to be loyal subjects of the king to decline to receive his messages, but a technicality furnished an excuse to the leaders. Heralds, it was said, could only pass between enemies and equals. To send this one was a device of Mazarin to lead the Parliament to acknowledge itself the enemy of its king, and entitled to treat with him as one sovereign with another. Admission to the city was, therefore, refused to the herald, and he was obliged to content himself with fastening his despatches to the bar of the gate of St. Honoré.[3]

On the 19th of February, a week later, the Prince of Conti informed the Parliament that an envoy of the Archduke Leopold prayed an audience. To refuse admission to a messenger of the king of France, and to receive

[1] Journal du Parlement, 192. [2] Retz, i., 272, 280, 291. Molé, 441.
[3] Journal du Parlement, 184–188. Talon, 332, 334. Retz, i., 278, 282. Ormesson, 661, 665. Dis. Ven., cviii., 214.

one from the king of Spain, was a step that was openly treasonable, and many were alarmed to see themselves drifting into an alliance with the public enemies. President Mesmes asked Conti if it was possible that a prince of the blood would ask a reception upon the fleurs-de-lys for the representative of the most cruel enemy of France. "A Spaniard does not frighten me as much as a Mazarinite," cried one. "We have," said Charton, "two enemies: the one open, the other secret; the one Spanish, the other Italian; the one proud and haughty, the other false, cunning, and dissembling. I mistrust the cardinal more than the archduke." [1]

A resolution was passed for the reception of the envoy, and he presented an artful letter on behalf of the archduke. In truth he was not a regularly accredited ambassador as he claimed, but a monk sent by Leopold, whose address was prepared in Paris by Retz and his associates. In this he stated that Mazarin had for two years refused advantageous offers of peace, but since the king had left Paris, he had offered favorable terms to Spain if it would now unite its troops with those of the king, to chastise the rebels of Parliament, and bring Paris to reason. But the Catholic king was unwilling to contribute to the oppression of so august a body, or to trust a man condemned and declared an enemy by its decree. He preferred to submit to its members, as arbitrators, reasonable terms of peace, and, in the meantime, he offered to Parliament 19,000 soldiers to be used solely for its protection and under its orders.[2]

These offers from Spain were heard with dismay by many of the judges. As servants of the king, their consciences reproached them for listening to such propositions. Many of the magistrates found they had been carried much farther than they had anticipated, in open opposition to the king. The position of avowed disobedience to the royal authority was alien to their legal train-

[1] Ormesson, 673.

[2] Talon, 336. Journal du Parlement, 196–202. Retz, 282–298.

ing and to their respect for law. In the city, also, there was a feeling of langour and weariness. The taxes levied were severe and odious. No heroic or inspiring achievement relieved the disarrangement of business which resulted from a condition of partial siege. The price of bread had now become high, and there was much complaint. The judges discussing technicalities all day, or examining whether some silver plate or bags of coins could be declared prizes of war, could not keep warm the fervor of revolt. The generals had shown too little skill to excite enthusiasm or confidence. It was charged that the courts clung to technicalities and could not depart from forms in affairs whose urgency allowed no forms; that these judicial bodies, organized for times of peace, could never be fitted for seasons of commotion.[1] Many therefore were desirous to find some way for reconciliation, though they were opposed by the younger judges, who were eager for excitement, and by the populace, who were inclined to disturbance. When it refused to receive the king's herald, the Parliament, by way of compromise, had coupled with the refusal a resolution to send an embassy to the queen explaining and justifying the act. It was also resolved that the message from the archduke should be reported to St. Germain for the regent's consideration.[2]

There was some debate whether deputies should be received from a body which had refused an audience to the king's messenger, and granted one to the envoy of the archduke. But the queen and Mazarin were both willing to avail themselves of any fair opening for negotiations. They found themselves involved in a tedious and almost impossible task, that of reducing a great city by starvation, and that city was the capital of the kingdom. Persistence in the endeavor might compel an alliance of the Fronde with Spain, deprive the queen of the regency, and reduce the kingdom to the condition of England. The situation of Normandy and of several of the southern

[1] Retz, 272, 280.

[2] Journal du Parlement, *supra*.

provinces was critical, and the attitude of Spain was very threatening.[1]

The *coup d' état* had proved abortive, and it was best to retire from their position on any reasonable terms. Molé's request that the edict of January 6th, "that fatal and unhappy day," might be revoked, was, therefore, listened to with complaisance, and conferences at Ruel were agreed upon to consider terms. During these negotiations, free passage of provisions was to be allowed into Paris. Measures that looked towards peace caused turmoil among the eager Frondeurs. On hearing that terms with St. Germain were to be discussed, a mob gathered about the Palace of Justice, crying, "No peace! No Mazarin! Long live the coadjutor!" But some cried, "Give us bread, or peace!"[2]

On February 28th, it was decided to send representatives from the Parliament and the Hotel de Ville, with full powers to make peace on such terms as they should deem advantageous for the state, and especially for the city of Paris. On the 4th of March, twenty-two deputies met at Ruel with the representatives of the king.[3]

But among the latter was Mazarin, and with him, as a man condemned to exile, the deputies of the Parliament said they could, under no consideration, confer. Both sides were firm. "There will be no conference and no peace," said Anne to her attendants; "so much the worse for them." But neither Condé nor Orleans

[1] "The truth was," Lionne wrote Servien, "it was necessary to make terms on account of the archduke, whose vanguard had already entered the kingdom." Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 318. Carnet, xi., 56. Journal du Parlement, 214. Dis. Ven., cix., 225.

[2] Retz, i., 330. Motteville, 256, 259. Ormesson, 695. Bread was now very dear. Journal d' Aubenay, Feb. 27, 1649.

Mazarin's Carnets show the arguments he constantly used with the queen to prove the necessity for his own retention. The news of the execution of Charles I. reached Paris, and Mazarin shows how this had resulted from his abandonment of his principal minister, Strafford.—Carnet, xii., 5, 6, 8, 10, 76.

References to the English Parliament and its conduct at this time are frequent in his notes., x., 86, xii., 8, 9, *et pas.*

[3] Reg. de l' Hotel de Ville, i., 328. Journal du Parlement, 215, 340.

wished the negotiations to fail, and it was agreed that two from each party, of whom Mazarin should not be one, should confer together and report to their respective associates.[1]

A week of conference followed, during which the prospect of peace seemed remote. Bouillon and Retz continued their negotiations with the Spaniards, and both parties were eager for a union of forces. Turenne had formally declared himself for the insurgents. He had been treated with marked favor by Mazarin and by the regent. He had received the command of the army in Germany, and had already gained for himself a military reputation second only to that of Condé. Suddenly to abandon the king he served, and unite his fortunes with those of a doubtful rebellion, seemed contrary to his cautious and deliberate temperament. No reason was assigned for his act, but sympathy for his brother, the Duke of Bouillon, and the family ambition for the recovery of Sedan, probably led him to take such a step.

The leaders of the Fronde hoped from it the most important results. Turenne commanded the remains of the Weimerian forces, the veterans of almost a dozen years of German warfare, and devoted to their leader. He would lead these soldiers to Paris, and scatter the inefficient and inexperienced troops commanded by Condé and Orleans. The government declared Turenne guilty of high treason, and this declaration was, on the 8th, annulled by the Parliament.[2]

On March 11th, the Duke of La Trémouille offered, within ten days, to march ten thousand men to the assist-

[1] Molé, iii., 348–360. Talon, 338–344. Reg. de l'Hotel de Ville, 273, 274, 328–336. Motteville, 254. Brienne, 106. Dis. Ven., cix., 1–9.

[2] Mazarin seems accurately to have forecast Turenne's course. He wrote that Bouillon had not received satisfaction in the matter of Sedan, and he would excite Turenne to commit some folly. Turenne, in his memoirs, gives no explanation of his course, except that he thought the departure of the king from Paris a rash and improper act during a minority. The letters of the regent, endeavoring to hold Turenne to his allegiance, show the importance the Court attached to his course.—Mém. de Turenne, 421–424. Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 287, 291, 1082, *et passim*.

ance of the Fronde, on condition that he should be allowed to seize the monies of the government at Poitiers and other places. The Parliament at once instructed him to send forward his troops, and help himself to the monies.[1]

But on the same day the negotiations of Ruel were brought to a sudden close by the signing of articles of peace. The representatives on both sides were anxious to come to terms, and at nine o'clock on the evening of the 11th., they reached an agreement, and the articles were signed forthwith. There had been a large variation in the terms proposed by the opposite parties. Orleans and Condé demanded that there should be no assembly of the chambers of the Parliament for three years, without the express permission of the king, except for their ordinary judicial duties, and at no time should any one participate in such meetings who had not served for twenty years; twenty-five of the body should retire from Paris, and a solemn deputation of aldermen and citizens should demand pardon of the king in behalf of the inhabitants of the city. The effects and furniture confiscated must be restored, or reparation made for their loss.

Such terms, however, were promptly refused. Some of the representatives were active Frondeurs, and even Molé, and the President Mesmes, who were most anxious for peace, were tenacious of the dignity of the body to which they belonged. They demanded in their reply that free pardon should be granted to all; the edict against the Parliament should be annulled, and his majesty should be humbly requested to enforce the edict of 1617, which forbade any foreigner being admitted into the ministry or management of affairs; the declarations of May, July, and October, 1648, should be inviolably observed, and Paris be discharged from the taille for three years. Orleans and Condé were at first little inclined to yield any

[1] Retz. ii., 38. Reg. d' Hot. de Ville, i., 313, 314. Journal du Parlement, 371. The sale of Mazarin's furniture still continued, and on the 9th, Ormesson saw great quantities struck off to an Abbé of Normandy, and a tall stranger named Lopes buying numerous tables and other articles. —Ormesson, 703.

thing, and the prince manifested more than his usual hauteur; but on the 11th a disposition was shown to compromise, and terms were agreed upon. It was said that Mesmes and Mazarin had decided, at a secret conference, that some terms must be made without more delay.[1]

By this agreement, amnesty was granted to all, and the edicts were revoked that banished the Parliament to Montargis, or imposed penalties upon its members. But during the year 1649, there should be no assembly of the chambers upon any pretext, except for regular meetings, to discuss their own procedure and internal regulations. Their decrees passed during the insurrection, except in the ordinary decision of cases, were likewise to be regarded as of no effect. Loans might be made by the king during the years 1649–50, as he should judge necessary for the expenses of the state, at the rate of eight and one third per cent.[2]

Conti and all those who had joined with the Parliament were to be restored to any offices which they held when they took up arms, if they declared within four days that they joined in the peace. To show his affection for his good city of Paris, the king would return there as soon as matters of state allowed, and, as a compliment to the Parliament, one of its members should be chosen whenever deputies were sent to treat for peace with Spain. No reference was made to the edicts of the past year, and the taille at Paris was left for the king's further consideration.[3]

---

[1] Retz, ii., 41–43. But, as the coadjutor claims he was a principal object in their conferences, his statement must be received with the allowance required from his constant desire to magnify his own importance in these transactions. Mazarin claimed afterwards that if Condé and Orleans had remained firm, Paris and the Parliament would have been obliged to surrender unconditionally.—Lettres à la Reine, 11, April, 1651.

[2] Molé, iii., 372. M. Cheruel says this was to be allowed only for 1649, but the treaty as published in Molé shows it was for 1650 also.

[3] Molé, iii., 370–374. A very full account of the whole negotiation is contained in the Reg. de l'Hotel de Ville, 1., 328–371. See also Journal du Parlement, 342–381. See Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 316–324. He expresses great satisfaction in his letters, and says the peace restores the authority of the king and will destroy the hopes the Spanish had built on their dissensions.

By this treaty the regent failed to attain what had been hoped in January would result from the abandonment of Paris, but the terms were even more unpalatable to the Fronde. The Parliament was indeed to remain at Paris, but for the rest of 1649 it was to consider no political questions. For almost a year it abdicated its position as a legislative body. What was still worse, Mazarin remained in full power; not only was he undisturbed in his office, but his name was signed to the treaty as one of the representatives of the king.

The leading Frondeurs heard of the treaty late at night on the 11th, and they at once began to consider in what manner it might be rejected. It was easy to excite turbulence in the mob, by the cry that the judges had agreed to a treaty that was signed by Mazarin. The majority of the Parliament, also, were at first displeased by this act of their representatives, but it was probable that their resentment would be brief. But the anger of the noble allies was strong and deep. A peace had been made, not only without their counsel, but without provision for their interests. It insured them indemnity indeed, but they had taken up arms, not for indemnity, but for gain. Yet they had declared that they joined the Parliament that their last drop of blood might be shed for the public weal, and now they would be driven to say that they would consent to no terms, but such as would secure their individual emolument. In these straits Bouillon favored protracting the negotiations until the army of the archduke could reach Paris, when he would be in position to continue the war or dictate terms. Some advocated separating entirely from the Parliament, closing the gates against the deputies on their return, and with sufficient forces coercing the magistrates both of the Hotel de Ville and the Palace of Justice. Retz had a policy so intricate and devious that no one else could understand it. But their secret and lengthy consultations resulted in nothing, except an endeavor to keep the Parliament from accepting the articles of peace.[1]

[1] Retz, ii., 45–57.

It was urged by many of the judges that the authority of the deputies had ceased before they signed the treaty. There had been complaints that supplies were not allowed to pass freely, and on the 9th, the Parliament had resolved that the conference should be suspended till there should be free passage for all sorts of provisions. An amendment had delayed the publication of this resolution, until information could be received whether further safe-conducts for wheat had been sent.[1] There was little doubt but that Molé and some of those with him were desirous of peace, and had hastened the treaty, in the fear that negotiations might be abandoned. They had resolved to take upon themselves the heavy responsibility of signing a peace that possibly would be rejected, and would expose them to opprobrium and the danger of violence. On the 13th of March they returned to Paris and presented the treaty to the Parliament. As its members entered the palace they found a mob surrounding it and filling the great hall, crying with confused and terrifying clamor: "No Peace!" "No Mazarin!" "Throw the Mazarinites into the Seine!" The body assembled, and the first president arose to make his report. But he was met with cries of "No peace!" "No report!" "The treaty is null and made against our orders!" "Wheat was not furnished!" "Longueville and the generals are not included!" He made himself heard at last, and a long discussion followed.

In the meantime a great tumult raged outside the door, the people crying for the treaty to be given them, that the common hangman might burn the signature of Mazarin. The Marquis of Longas urged the court to send out a paper with a counterfeit signature, but the Parliament was not yet willing to yield to mob law. The time for adjournment was reached, and the mob was so fierce that Molé, who was in most danger from its violence, was advised to go out through the record office, and so escape unnoticed. "This court does not hide itself," replied the

[1] Journal du Parlement, 361.

first president; "they would find me at home if they thought I feared them here." Retz and Beaufort were believed to have aroused this tumult, but they walked out through the grand hall with Molé, and he passed unmolested through the crowd. Cries of "A republic!" were heard as they passed out.[1]

On the 15th the treaty came up for further discussion. Broussel said this was a very serious deliberation, and it had best be postponed. "It is serious," said Molé, "and therefore it had best be finished." The debate proceeded, Bouillon defending the military policy and prospects of the Fronde, and Broussel attacking the terms of the treaty. It was null, he said, because made contrary to orders; it consented to abandon the meetings of the Parliament; by the articles on loans it showed that this war had been carried on solely for the interest of the money-lenders, and by surrendering the arsenal and Bastille it furnished the means of destroying Paris. Retz declared that he, more than any one else, desired peace, but he wished it to be safe and honorable, and this was neither; the sessions of the Parliament were prohibited; the generals failed in their efforts to deliver the public from a man who had been declared the enemy of the state; all things were in a condition for them to obtain a glorious peace; they should not accept this agreement, but ask from the queen terms worthy her goodness and justice. The articles as to the loans repelled the President Hodic. He said the presence of the archduke was better than peace on such conditions, for the archduke was a Catholic enemy, obeying God, but loans and usury, which the articles allowed, were contrary to God's laws, as well as man's. But Broussel disconcerted his associates by declaring his vote for the acceptance of the treaty, upon the condition that the deputies should return to St. Germain in order to obtain the revocation of certain articles, and to treat of the interest of the generals. The friends of the measure were content with this resolution, which practi-

[1] Retz, ii., 62.

cally confirmed the treaty, and left the interests of the generals where they might be urged, but could not be made a condition of peace. All, therefore, cast their votes for the motion of the popular Frondeur, and it prevailed.

Broussel was a meré child in the affairs in which his arrest had given him an accidental prominence. Shrewder men used him to advance their plans. He was easily persuaded by any sophistry, and his great favor with the people made any thing that he advocated popular with them. But he was a dangerous ally, for his mind was very simple, and after speaking one way, he would give the victory to the enemy by some act, the effect of which he was unable to understand.[1]

In conformity with this resolution, the deputies on the 16th returned to St. Germain, to ask for modification in the terms that had been granted by the regent. The generals and princes had submitted separate statements of what each demanded for himself, and many of them conducted private negotiations in their own behalf. The generals were charmed with a programme which allowed them to play the bravo in the Parliament all day, and try to make terms with the government all night. But a statement of their demands, which Molé, perhaps with a malicious intention, at once made public, covered them with ridicule. Each seemed to vie with the other in the preposterous greed of his desires. Even the smallest officers had sent requests, which would have been large if they had been demanded by Longueville or Bouillon.[2] Retz had sufficient dignity or sufficient shrewdness to preserve his claim for disinterestedness, and he asked for nothing. He even refused to have his name inserted in the treaty among those who were specifically declared to be included in the amnesty, saying that, as he had done nothing which he had not believed to be for the service

[1] For these debates see Ormesson, 705–720; Talon, 346, 347; Retz, ii., 51–65; Journal du Parlement, 383–393.

[2] "Chacun croyt d'aujourdhui de fayre ses affayres dans les minorités des Roys."—Carnet, xii., 59.

of the king and the interest of the state, he needed no amnesty.[1]

No such modesty was shown by his associates. Conti asked for a position in the council and the government of some strong place. Rochefoucauld demanded the tabouret for his wife, and for himself eighteen thousand livres for commanding the fusiliers, to be continued whether there were fusiliers or not. Longueville wanted an important government in Normandy, with the reversion to his children. Elbœuf asked for the payment of large sums that were claimed to be due to him and to his wife. Beaufort wished Brittany for his father, and money for himself. Bouillon desired a vast sum of money as compensation for the loss of Sedan, and for Turenne the government of Alsace and Philipsburg. For La Mothe over 700,000 livres of compensation were required, and the Prince of Harcourt and others of less degree made requests that were nearly as large.[2]

To preserve their dignity in some degree, Conti declared in their behalf that if Cardinal Mazarin, the sole cause of all the evils of France, was retired, they would abandon their just claims, and they sent a special deputy to announce this resolution.[3]

But all knew that the regent would as soon lose her own right hand as sacrifice Mazarin. The deputies were informed that subjects must not prescribe the choice of the ministers of state to the sovereign, and that both the Duke of Orleans and the Prince of Condé deemed the retention of Mazarin advantageous to the kingdom.[4]

The hopes of the Frondeurs had already met with a disappointment. By great activity and the use of large sums

[1] Retz, ii., 112. This omission was unjustly and unfairly used by Mazarin in 1655 as allowing him to press against Retz charges for whatever he had done in 1648–9.

[2] These requests are contained in full in Molé, filling twenty-two printed pages—iii., 449–471. They are also condensed, though with her usual correctness, by Mme. de Motteville, 267–269. "De' principi generali le pretentioni eccedenti."—Dis. Ven., cix., 22.

[3] Talon, 348. Molé, iii., 471, 474.

[4] Molé, iii., 475, *et seq.*

of money in bribing the officers and paying to the soldiers the arrears due them, the greater portion of Turenne's army had been induced to desert him. Finding himself abandoned by his troops, he retired with a handful of followers into Holland.[1] Retz says that a special messenger announced this alarming news to him and Bouillon, when they were conferring with representatives of the archduke.[2]

The archduke was still desirous of advancing to Paris, and his army entered the French territory. But the Frondeurs apprehended that if they were unsupported by Turenne, the assistance of the archduke might become a dictatorship, and they did not wish to sacrifice themselves to help Spain, but to sacrifice Spain to help themselves. The merchants and artisans were suffering from the dearness of provisions. Being without business, the bourgeois were forced to discharge their domestics, and were in danger of losing their credit. They now desired peace without delay.[3]

Conti, the generalissimo of the Fronde, feigned frequent illness, because, it was said, he was afraid of the disturbances at the palace.[4]

Yet Mazarin did not feel entirely safe in his position. The Parliament of Paris was respected and he was detested over all France. Many Parliaments and cities had

---

[1] Mém. de Turenne, iv., 22, 23, 422, 423. Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 291, 1082 *et passim*.

[2] It would seem that this news must have reached them before the articles were signed on March 11th. A letter of Lionne, of March 6th, says that Turenne had been abandoned by his army. Aff. Etr., t. cxxv., p. 73. Mazarin speaks of this intelligence discouraging the representatives at Ruel. Let. de Mazarin, iii., 307, March 7th. The duty of buying the German mercenaries away from Turenne was entrusted to Barthélemy Herwarth, *ib.*, iii., 308, *et passim*.

[3] Talon, 357. Dis. Ven., cix., 18. "La maggiore parte dei Parlamentarii e de' Popoli mutati d' opinione," etc.

[4] Retz, 104. Conti was ridiculed in the political satire of the time:

"L' univers doit être averti,
Qu'il a sauvé la pauvre France,
Monsieur le Prince de Conti,
Avec son zèle et prudence."

declared their union, and were raising troops for the common cause.[1] The armies of the archduke had reached Pontavert, and Mazarin thought that the Parliament should be conciliated.[2]

A personal annoyance may also have increased the cardinal's desire for peace. The sale of his furniture still continued at Paris. It was said to have caused him much pain, because he loved what belonged to him, and especially what he had obtained from foreign countries with so much trouble. His palace had been magnificently furnished with tapestries, paintings, and statuary.[3]

The conferences were, therefore, held night and day. The article was omitted which forbade the joint sessions of the chambers of the Parliament during the year. The regent contented herself with the promise of the deputies that none should be held. The demand for a bed of justice at St. Germain was waived, and the restitution of the Bastille was not insisted upon. The demands of the princes and generals were treated with less favor. Mazarin boasted that with a little powder of alchemy he had destroyed this cloud of pretensions. "He would have been wiser," says Retz, "to have mingled a little gold."[4]

The leaders, at all events, received little but abundance of fair words. The sums justly due, the declaration said, should be paid. Vendôme was to receive his pension, and the king was to use his influence to induce the States of Brittany to compensate him for the destruction of his château, and on all occasions that might offer, his majesty would desire to favor and advance his family. For Harcourt and others, all was to be done that was possible. Commissioners were to consider what sum would be just to compensate Bouillon for Sedan, and Turenne was to be

[1] Reg. del' Hotel de Ville, 344, 377, 385. 399.

[2] Aff. Etr. Fr., dcccIxv., p. 110.

[3] In one of the Mazarinades, an inventory of some of his furniture and property was given, in order to excite the people by a description of its costliness. The pamphlet complained also of the shameful nudity of the statues. The statue of charity, it was said, was found in a dark place.—Mazarinades, vol. i., pages 143–148.

[4] Retz, ii., 109. Motteville, 267.

rewarded as his qualities and services demanded.[1] But the princes and generals received much more in promises, than in ready money or in commissions already sealed and delivered.[2] The articles were, however, agreed upon by the representatives of the courts and of the Hotel de Ville, and on April 1st, the king's declaration embodying them was presented to the Parliament. Popular ferment still threatened that body, and the streets were filled with men crying: "No peace! No Mazarin!" Those who favored the treaty declared that these emotions were excited by the use of money, and that some of these brawlers were heard in the grand hall of the palace saying: "You have promised us a scudo to cry 'No Mazarin!' but we have only been paid thirty sous. We will cry no longer."[3]

Fearful of some bloody tumult, companies of bourgeois guarded the Palace of Justice from four o'clock in the morning.[4] At nine o'clock the session began. The articles were read, and each of the princes and generals attacked what he considered was an insufficient allowance for himself. Bouillon complained that his interests had not been even discussed. To this Molé replied that his deputies had given no information, and that if he would say precisely what he wanted for Sedan that would be what they had thus far been unable to discover. An indiscreet debate disclosed the fact that the generals had negotiated separately for the best terms they could obtain, and that Bouillon had demanded the enormous sum of nine million livres, and said that nothing less would satisfy his pretensions.[5] Though many grumbled, it was useless to oppose, and the articles of peace were unanimously registered.[6]

---

[1] Mazarin, in a memorandum made March 21st, points out why no great favor should be granted a house whose chief had declared against the king and younger brother committed treason.—Let. de Mazarin, iii., 329–331.

[2] Molé, iii., 475, 493. [3] Ormesson, 727. [4] Talon, 350, 351.

[5] Mazarin said that in 1648 Bouillon demanded 18,000,000 as compensation for Sedan.—Lettres, iii., 105.

[6] Ormesson, 729, 733. Mazarin, Lettres, iii., 335, expresses disappointment at some of the conditions of the peace as finally made, but says they

The twelve weeks' war was ended, to the satisfaction of the Parliament, which desired that the forms of law should be no longer disturbed by insurrection, and of the better class of citizens, who wished for public tranquillity. But the peace created little enthusiasm among the people, who had hoped never again to see Mazarin, or among the nobles, who were disappointed of any advantages from this uprising.[1] Permanent tranquillity was by no means assured by the treaty. The popular discontent with Mazarin had become no less. The dissatisfied and turbulent nobles were neither contented nor intimidated. The government was not strong enough to restrain the people or overawe the nobility, and it excited neither love nor fear.

The disturbances in some of the provinces were not entirely allayed by the peace of Ruel. Normandy had joined in the treaty. Deputies from Rouen had visited St. Germain, and presented requests in behalf of their province. Among other things they stated that the ruin of commerce came chiefly from the impositions on manufactures and the entry of foreign goods, and the king was prayed to prohibit the introduction of dressed leather from foreign countries.[2] Satisfaction was granted to some of their requests. As to the latter, it was said that the merchants trafficking in such things must first be consulted.[3]

But serious attacks were still made on the royal authority. The payment of duties was stopped. Salt was taken from the royal store-houses, in which it was placed for the collection of the gabelle. Its open sale, at half the price demanded by the government monopoly, excited a feverish enthusiasm among the poor, who suffered from

---

could do no better, and it was by a miracle that they were so well rid of the demands of the generals and nobles. Talon, 350, 353. Journal du Parlement, 393–427.

[1] Dis. Ven., cix., 31. "Il Popolo di Parigi non apparendo per la sua parte intieramente contento," etc. The unsettled condition of popular feeling and the probability of new troubles are constantly referred to by the ambassador. [2] Molé, vol. iii., 426, 427. [3] Molé, iii., 437, 440.

this odious tax.[1] Some concession had been made to the Parliament of the province, but its chief desire was for the abolition of the semestre, the new judges created by Richelieu, who diminished the duties and emoluments of the former members, and in this it failed.[2]

The creation in 1647 of a semestre in Provence, added to a long series of encroachments upon local rights, had there excited a general feeling of discontent. The sentiments of the older judges were so bitter that they hoped to prevent the sale of any of the offices of this new creation. An advocate named Gueydon, who was among the first who sought to become a member of the semestre, was assassinated.[3] But purchasers were found who dared death for fees. At the first sound of a revolt in Paris, the Parliament of Provence sent a petition to demand aid and protection. A peace was negotiated in March for them by Cardinal Bichi, and the offices of the additional judges were abolished, upon reimbursement to those who had bought the positions. The province and its governor continued, however, on very bad terms, and there was constant discontent and disturbance.[4]

The condition of Guienne was still worse. The oppressions of a local potentate had there, also, aggravated the discontent against the general government. The governor of the province was the Duke of Épernon, in whose family pride, selfishness, and tyranny seemed to be hereditary. In 1648 the duke had excited serious troubles. Bribed by a gift of twelve thousand livres, he authorized some merchants to export wheat from Guienne, which was then suffering from a severe dearth, and send it to Spain, where the need was still greater. When all nations allow the unchecked exportation of grain, and it flows freely to that quarter of the world where it is most needed, such a measure would not seem improper. But

[1] Floquet, "Parlement de Normandie," t. v.

[2] Molé, iii., 427, 439.

[3] "La Fronde en Provence."

[4] Journal du Parlement, 129, *et passim.* Dis. Ven., cix., *passim.* "La Fronde en Provence," Gaffarel, published in the Revue Historique, 1876. Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 332, *et passim.*

at a time when the means of transportation were imperfect, and when artificial barriers increased the difficulties of communication, to ship a moderate amount of grain from a district might bring upon it the possibility of famine, and the certainty of famine prices. It required more time, expense, and labor to send a quantity of wheat from Picardy to Poitou than now to ship it from Kansas and lay it down on the docks of Havre or Marseilles. The transportation of supplies was not only difficult, and hindered by countless duties of ferryage, ingress and egress, but in times of scanty crops it was often forbidden. Local feelings were not then merged into national sympathies, and Maine, in its hour of need, would spare no bread for Brittany, nor Burgundy for Champagne. Ignorance of the condition of affairs in neighboring districts still further hindered that uniformity of prices, which comes from cheap transportation and frequent communication. Differences often existed in the prices of food and labor at a distance of one hundred miles, greater than would now be found between Iowa and Hesse Cassel.

The exportation of a small amount of grain from Guienne might therefore cause a famine, and a furious crowd gathered about the quays to stop its shipment. Épernon tried to check the disturbance, but he was surrounded by crowds of men dressed in rags, and of starving women, crying out that they were perishing from hunger and he was sending away bread. The king cancelled the permission granted by the governor, but the condition of the province continued disturbed, and it became worse after the outbreak of Paris. These troubles did not cease with the peace of Ruel, and Epernon's forces inflicted severe loss on the ill-disciplined rebels, who had no military skill except such as was furnished by famine and despair.[1]

Such disorders, though no great armies met and no great victories were won, caused as much distress to the

[1] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 343. Lettre d'Argenson à Mazarin, May 16, 1649. These disturbances are quite fully stated in Dis. Ven., cix., and cx., and Let. de Maz., iii., *passim*.

country as if it had been a battlefield for the forces of Gustavus and Wallenstein. One account out of many describes the misery of Guienne, a misery no greater there than in the other provinces which were scourged by the presence of the armies. "The country around Bordeaux," it says, "is in great desolation. One hears only the cries of the miserable inhabitants, one sees only the villages burned and the roads strewed with the dead. It is a country of desolation and sadness. Camblanes, Carignan, and Tresses were for several days the prey of the soldiers, who were the more insolent because their excesses were unpunished. At Camblanes the church to which the inhabitants had fled was given to the flames, and a young girl, pursued by the soldiers, threw herself into them, preferring death to dishonor."

Normandy was also infested by disbanded soldiers, robbing, pillaging and murdering, while the fields that had been abandoned in despair by their laborers, remained untilled.[1] In Picardy were five German regiments, accompanied by 1,500 women and 900 servants. They did not know the language of the people on whom they were quartered, and they regarded them as idolaters worshipping the mass. Their taste for pillage was increased because they did not receive their pay. To robbery and rape for employment, they added murder and torture for amusement. They dressed up a goat in the clothes of a woman they had killed, put it to bed, and took the curé there to administer the sacraments of the church. He refused to turn his religion into a travesty, and they tortured him to death. Peasants had fire put to the soles of their feet to compel them to discover their hoards, which usually had no existence, and if this was not effectual their daughters were violated before their faces. The country was filled with outcasts seeking the alms and shelter which few were able to afford them.[2]

[1] See statements published in "La Misère," 144, 151. Complaints of such outrages are referred to by the Venetian ambassador, cix., 47, *et pas.*

[2] Contemporary relation published in "Le Diocese de Laon pendant la Fronde."

Though such ruin made more miserable the lot of those whose fate at best was poverty and need, the civil war was regarded by many of its leaders as an amusing burlesque. It was called by Tallemant a burlesque war, "*Guerre pour rire*," and it was deemed by the ladies of the Fronde such a war as might be waged by the Grand Duchess of Gerolstein.

At Paris, the leaders of the insurrection were now engaged in presenting their submission to the government, and in forming combinations for new disorders. The position of the Prince of Condé was in such plans the most important element. His relations were naturally with the Frondeurs. Mme. de Longueville was again on friendly terms with him, and she used her sisterly arts to draw him from his alliance with Mazarin. The aristocratic Frondeurs saw in the prince a man whose rank and character made him their most proper leader. On the other hand, Mazarin and the regent were willing to purchase his support at any price. Condé felt that by the aid he had given the government in the last few months, he had deserved from it more than all it could bestow. Nothing could long satisfy a man who inherited his father's colossal greed, and joined to it a pride and lust for power peculiar to himself. Both Condé and all others overestimated the real value of his assistance. He had the power which belonged to his position as first prince of the blood, and that power was great. He had vast possessions, large territorial influence, and the reputation that comes from brilliant victories. All those things made him important in the state, but not all-important. In the greater part of France he had no popular support, and he excited no popular enthusiasm. He had won battles, indeed, and shown that reckless valor and brilliant audacity which excites more admiration than the achievements of a soldier like Turenne. But the glamour of Lens and Rocroi was overshadowed by Condé's pride, arrogance, and greed. In a time when few generals cared for the misery and ruin of the people, Condé cared least of all. Not only the hard-

ships that were caused by the siege of Paris, but the cruelties practised and the devastation wrought on French soil as freely as if it were German, inflamed the popular mind against him. The country around Paris had been devastated and the fields laid bare, men murdered, and women violated.[1] At Charenton it was said that Condé's troops threw some of the prisoners into the Seine, which there flows towards Paris, saying: "Go, and see your Parliament." Some were stripped and left naked in the cold, and Mlle. of Orleans sent money with which to clothe them from her own pocket.

Condé visited Paris after the peace, but his vulture face was seen with aversion by the people, who despised him as the supporter of Mazarin, and hated him as a man addicted to cruelty, the one vice from which they acknowledged Mazarin was free.[2] The women in the streets shrieked insolent words at his carriage as it passed, and reproached him with the misery which they had suffered during the siege. He continued, however, to exercise a great influence at Court. The chief Frondeurs paid their respects to the regent, but they were received with chilling coolness by Anne, who disliked to conceal her animosities. Mme. de Longueville, we are told, being naturally timid and likely to blush, was so impressed at her reception that it was with difficulty that she said any thing to the queen.[3] The regent and the great frondeuse had been unfriendly before they met, and they parted with increased dislike. Retz also waited upon the regent, but he insisted that his position at Paris would be imperilled by his visiting the cardinal, though the queen pressed him to do so, with much ill-humor at his refusal.

Some brawls at Paris, in themselves of little importance, excited an undue amount of popular interest. At the end of the present garden of the Tuileries, Renard then had a garden and restaurant where the Place de la Con-

[1] Ormesson, 739, Journal du Parlement, *passim*.

[2] Talon, 359. Dis. Ven., cix., 43, April 20th: "Senza applauso, ma con striddi de tutto il populo," etc.

[3] Motteville, 274.

corde is now. There, on the terrace, the great nobles lounged, supped for two pistoles a plate, talked gossip and politics.[1] There Jarzé, a nobleman of small importance, met with some companions, among whom was the Duke of Candale, a son of the Duke of Épernon, and also a deformed dwarf, who was to become the great Marshal of Luxembourg.

They sounded the praises of Mazarin and Condé amid the strumming of the violins and the cracking of the bottles. They had added some raillery upon the Duke of Beaufort, and the king of the Fronde and of the markets felt that this his dignity could not suffer. He appeared at one of those suppers with a large body of followers, and after some words of dispute, he seized the cloth and pulled it from the table, throwing dishes and bottles in one common ruin. A scuffle followed in which no one was seriously hurt, but the followers of the two parties were excited to great animosity by this brawl.[2]

Such exploits only increased the popularity of Beaufort among the populace of Paris. When shortly afterwards he fell sick, there was a procession of people all day long at the Hotel Vendôme, to get news of his condition. It was said that two thousand women visited him in one day. Many, throwing themselves on their knees, prayed that health might be restored to their father and liberator. When he played at the tennis court the milk-women clamored for admission. "Play boldly," one cried to him; "you shall never lack for money. My gossip and I have brought you two hundred crowns, and if you need more we will go for it."[3]

Another street encounter is one of the many proofs of the lawlessness of the times. Some Frondeurs, filled with wine and patriotism from dining at Termes, started in search of those riotous adventures which were freely indulged in by reckless and dissipated young nobles, and

[1] See Joly, 23. Ormesson, 746. Motteville, 279. Retz, ii., 137–8.

[2] Motteville, 279, 280. Joly, 23. Retz, ii., 137, 140. Talon, 359.

[3] Joly, 23, 24. Lettres de Gui Patin, vol. i., p. 43: "in numero infinito corsero alla sua habitatione," Dis Ven., cix., 55.

which helped to make a walk through the streets of Paris by night as alarming a journey for the peaceful shopkeeper, as an excursion among the banditti of Sicily. They met with some lackeys whose uniform showed that they were of the king's household, and this would ordinarily have protected them from assault. But the Frondeurs said kings were no longer in fashion, and they attacked the unlucky valets and beat them unmercifully, bidding them go and tell the queen and Mazarin.[1]

For publishing a very gross and vulgar libel upon the regent, one Morlot had been condemned to death. But when he was taken to the Grève, the mob charged the officers, crying: "Down with the Mazarinites!" Morlot was rescued, and left the officers to escape from the mob with difficulty.[2]

All these insults to the royal authority irritated Anne of Austria, but she could not attack and punish them. The Court was said by one of its members to have been in a sad plight. To the usual disorders of the treasury, were added the difficulties of collecting the taxes in many of the provinces. Even the royal table was poorly furnished. Some of the crown jewels were in pawn, and the young pages were sent to their homes because there was no money to pay them.[3]

These disturbances affected the armies, where the pay of the soldiers was more irregular than usual. The ratifications of the Peace of Westphalia had been exchanged in February, with a provision that France should be released from the promised payment of three million livres for Alsace, until Spain had consented to its cession. With Spain itself no peace could be made. Mazarin would not grant more favorable terms on account of the internal disturbances, while the Spanish hoped much from the Frondeurs and desired no peace, except on conditions far more advantageous than those which were offered. "If I am reviled," the cardinal wrote in his private

[1] Motteville, 283. Talon, 361.

[2] Registres de l'Hotel de Ville, ii., 34. [3] Motteville, 284.

minutes, "having served as I have done, what would be said of me if I consented to disgraceful terms of peace. They would say from my own desire for vengeance I had obliged the queen to sacrifice the interests of the king."[1]

Notwithstanding the troubles in the provinces and the lawlessness in Paris, Mazarin did not abandon the war against Spain. Condé had declined the command of the army, anticipating, perhaps, little glory from the campaign, and it was entrusted to the experienced Count of Harcourt. Ypres had been captured by the archduke, and it was decided to lay siege to the important city of Cambray as an offset to this loss. The cardinal took great interest in this endeavor. He wrote Tellier it was a matter of life and death that money should be raised to proceed with the siege, and that the Crown jewels and his own would be pledged if any one could be found to loan on them.[2] Cambray was attacked on June 24th, but on July 3d the archduke succeeded in throwing reinforcements into the place, and Harcourt abandoned the siege.[3] The news of this defeat was received with open exultation by the enemies of the Court, who preferred national disaster to Mazarin's prosperity.[4] The cardinal was greatly disappointed by these reverses, and, though ordinarily smiling and impassible in times of ill-success, he showed his discomfiture openly.[5]

Mazarin went to St. Quentin in order to visit the army

---

[1] Carnets, xi., 96.

[2] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 359–374. These letters show the curious shifts to which a government turned when it had an army and had no ready money. The Carnets show the same interest—xii., 53: "Envoyer M. le Comte d'Arcourt pour commander l' armée et la fayre partir à plustot," 53–6, 60 *et seq.*, are full of the schemes for raising money.

[3] Montglat, 213. Dis. Ven., cix., 103, 109, 114. Let. de Mazarin, iii., 375.

[4] Dis Ven., cix., *passim*.

[5] In his letters to Le Tellier (Let. de Mazarin, iii. 375–6) Mazarin expresses his disappointment, and also criticises Harcourt's conduct. "But," he says, "we must be careful not to speak of it, lest the leaders of our troops may think we mistrust them. We must even see in what manner this matter is discussed in the *Gazette*." See also letters published in Molé, iv., 348, 356, July, 1649.

personally. The German mercenaries, formerly commanded by Turenne, were there, having been brought from Flanders under the command of General Erlach. Mazarin entertained their principal officers, and they all became exceedingly drunk, in conformity, as we are told, with the German custom.[1]

Harcourt resumed the campaign, notwithstanding the check at Cambray, captured the town of Condé, and devastated the neighboring territory, but dissensions and want of money prevented a considerable success, although the French were superior in numbers.[2] In Catalonia, the Spanish had hoped to profit by the weakness of the French government to regain much of the territory they had lost; but the inhabitants of the province, seeing that France could do little for them, furnished money and troops freely for the country of their adoption, and the Spanish made but small progress.[3]

In the unsettled condition of Paris, with the violent hostility to the cardinal that was manifested, the regent hesitated about returning to the city. But the absence of the king was a constant irritation. The populace missed the outward display of royalty, and the bourgeoisie missed the trade of the Court.[4] It did not seem that this condition of affairs would improve while the king remained away, and, on the 18th of August, he made a solemn entry into Paris. Nothing showed more clearly that the popular feeling had been only a caprice, and had rested on no strong convictions, than that the return of the regent was received with frenzied enthusiasm. An enormous multitude followed the king's carriage, and it could hardly pass through the crowd. The windows and roofs were alive with people; flags and decorations covered the houses; and at evening bonfires proclaimed the public joy, around which the inhabitants passed the night, drinking the health of their majesties. Even Mazarin, who

[1] See Mazarin's letters from St. Quentin to Le Tellier, of July 23, *et seq.* Lettres, tome iii. Mole, iv., 351–3. [2] Let. de Mazarin, iii., 381, *et pas.*

[3] Montglat, 214–216. [4] Dis. Ven., cix., 132, *et passim.*

Stockton, Calif.

rode in the king's carriage, was greeted with no more unfriendly words than the frequent remark, "There is Mazarin." It was perhaps true, as Retz said, that they were received as kings always have been and always will be received, with acclamations signifying nothing; and that those who applauded to-day would be ready to condemn on the morrow—to cry, "Down with Mazarin!" and to gossip about Madame Anne.[1]

To the queen this unexpected reception was the more gratifying, because her return had been delayed by the fear of personal danger to Mazarin. Instead of finding himself in danger of assault, the cardinal went in safety, with a scanty escort, through all parts of the city. The boatmen of the Seine gave a fête in his honor. Others talked of his beauty, and drank deeply to his health.[2]

The annoyances of the minister sprang less from his enemies than from his protector. Condé's demands constantly grew larger. His insolence was more open, and his contempt for the minister was less disguised. He was attended by flatterers, and followed by a body of young nobles, whose only political principle was a childish adulation of the Prince of Condé. They aped his grandiose manners, and as they styled the prince "The Master," they were themselves dubbed by the people, "Petits Maitres," the little masters. Anxious as Mazarin was for Condé's aid, he could not bring himself to give all the prince asked, nor probably all that he himself had promised, for the minister promised too freely to perform fully. Condé's jealousy was also excited by the endeavors of Mazarin to strengthen himself by matrimonial alliances, and by the part which Mazarin's nieces began to play in the politics of the day.

The experience of the last year had convinced the cardinal that he must seek support from powerful alliances, and his nieces were now nearing the age when they could

[1] Retz, vol. ii., 149–150. Montglat, 218–219. Motteville, 289. Supplement to Ormesson, 761–762. Dis. Ven., cix., 150.

[2] Motteville, *supra*, and *Journal de la Bibliothèque*, Aug., 1649.

be used in political combinations. For five years after he had become chief minister, Mazarin remained an isolated man. He had no relatives in France, and he brought none of his kinsmen from Italy to share his prosperity; on the contrary, he pointed to this as one of the proofs of his disinterestedness in public affairs. For himself he wished nothing, and he desired to have around him only the servants of the king. The beautiful statues from Rome, with which his palace was filled, he declared to be the only kinsmen he wished to bring from Italy.

His affection for his family was, however, strong, and he had used the diplomacy and power of France to make his brother a cardinal. From this brother he received little thanks, and less assistance, while nothing he had done excited such hostile criticism as his efforts for this begging friar.

Such a storm of abuse discouraged any desire to bring his father or sisters to France, but the younger members of his family seemed possible elements of strength.

Having been chief minister for nearly five years, firmly established in the queen's affections and apparently firmly established in power, he made his first experiment in transplanting his family. Mazarin's two sisters had married Roman gentlemen of fair position. The one, Signora Martinozzi, was a widow with two daughters. The other sister, Signora Mancini, had been blest with ten children.

In 1647 the cardinal sent Mme. de Noailles to Rome to bring to him the elder Martinozzi, and two daughters and one son of the Mancini. These children were from seven to thirteen years of age. Though they were required to go to a foreign land to which their mothers were not bidden, there was no hesitancy in sending them to the brilliant lot that would there await the adopted children and heirs of the great cardinal. In September they arrived at Fontainebleau, and were gazed at with curious eyes as children probably destined to brilliant and extraordinary fortunes. Laura Mancini, the eldest, was a handsome brunette of twelve or thirteen. Olympe was

also dark, with a long face and pointed chin. Anne Marie Martinozzi was a blonde, with soft, pleasing eyes, and features giving a promise, not to be unfulfilled, of great beauty. The queen received the children affably. They were given for their governess Mme. de Senécé, a lady of great rank, who had been the governess of Louis XIV. The courtiers crowded around them, and speculated as to their future fate, and they at once began a life differing little from that of those of the blood royal. The boy was educated by the Jesuits at the college of Clermont, receiving as much deference as a Condé or Vendôme.[1] Anne of Austria often took the nieces to her favorite resort, Val de Grace, and herself directed their devotions.

The arrival of the Italian family of the cardinal furnished abundant material for the wits and libellers of the Fronde. They said that he had brought from Rome little beggars, and had these Mazarinettes educated in the king's palace with all the state of princes of the blood.[2] Their persons were spared as little as their birth. They had the eyes of an owl, the skin of a cabbage, the eyebrows of a condemned soul, and the complexion of a chimney.[3] "Your nieces," wrote another scribbler, "those dumpy monkeys, were born paupers, and, worse than the Goths of old, have bidden adieu to their beggarly parents to be married to Candales and Richelieus."[4]

These young adventurers soon met with some of the vicissitudes of their lot. Only a few months after their arrival began the troubles of the Fronde, and during the retirement of the Court from Paris, the nieces were depos-

[1] Mém. de Motteville: Lettre du Père Michel, Feb. 19, 1649, published in Renée, "Niéces de Mazarin," 41.

[2] Choix des Mazarinades, vol. i., 50, 56, 104. Renée, page 56, gives the title of sixteen of these Mazarinades, devoted to the nieces, and mostly printed in 1649. "Regrets of the nieces of Mazarin over the evil life of their uncle," is the title of one, and gives a fair sample of the others. One bit of doggerel ran: "Adieu, uncle of the Mazarinettes. Adieu, father of the Marionettes. Adieu, drinker of lemonades and inventor of pomades. Conchino, Conchini, True rhyme to Mazarini."

[3] Satyre sur le Grand Adieu des Niéces de Mazarin à la France, 1649.

[4] Le ministre d'état flambé, 1651.

ited with the Sisters at the Val de Grace. But after the peace of Ruel, Mazarin turned his thoughts to the marriage of the eldest, Laura Mancini, who was now fifteen years old, and had the early maturity of children of southern climates.

> "Les Mancini, les Martinosses,
> Illustres matières de noces,"

a poet of the Fronde justly called them, and Mazarin, like many Italian ecclesiastics, knew the advantage of leading a flying squadron of beauties.

There had been thoughts of the Duke of Candale, the heir of the wealthy and powerful Duke of Épernon, for one of these children, but Candale was content with the rôle of a Lothario, for which his rank and great beauty fitted him, and he delayed matrimony. A still more inviting alliance was offered in the house of Vendôme. The Duke of Mercœur was a young man of high degree. His father, the Duke of Vendôme, was weary of opposition, and ready to receive in peace such good things as the cardinal would give to those allied to his family. Through Mercœur Mazarin hoped to be able to oppose the influence of Vendôme to that of Condé, and to gain Mercœur's brother, Beaufort, although that blonde Catiline was still entirely governed by Mme. de Montbazon.

The marriage was agreed upon.[1] Vendôme was to receive the admiralty. Mercœur was to have for dowry six hundred thousand livres and the first vacant government. Condé had consented to this alliance, but, as the time for it approached, he became opposed to a step that would make Mazarin less dependent and Vendôme more powerful.[2]

The cardinal desired to have the marriage celebrated in the latter part of September, and Condé was asked to sign the contract. He answered that he was not related to the parties, and his signature was not needed. He complained also that the cardinal had failed to obtain for him some

[1] Lettres de Mazarin, May 25, 1649, t. iii., 1113, *et passim.*
[2] Carnet, xii., 69, 70.

German possession, which was to have been purchased from the House of Wurtemberg, and he demanded with renewed zeal the government of Pont de l'Arche for Longueville, an office which would have increased the power of that duke in Normandy, where it already overshadowed the authority of the king.[1] As Mazarin was strenuous in his refusal to this, Condé left the room in wrath.[2]

The news of this rupture was instantly noised about the Court and town, and by the next morning, September 16th, the leaders of the Fronde were at Condé's palace, zealous with proffers of aid, and eager to enlist him as their commander. Condé was equally full of professions of zeal and sympathy, but fresh endeavors were made at a reconciliation. La Rivière acted as chief mediator, and on the 17th a new peace was made; the regent yielded Pont de l'Arche, and it was said that Condé was to have the sale of offices worth almost a million of livres, while neither Vendôme nor Mercœur was to be admiral. Condé told his sister that Mazarin and himself were now but two heads under one bonnet, but she answered him that such vacillation would presently leave him with neither friends nor good name.

On the night of the 17th Mazarin supped with the prince as a pledge of reconciliation. The feast was a sad one, and while all the guests were melancholy, the cardinal was the most melancholy of all. The prince also was serious, and found his only relaxation in slightly concealed sneers at the minister.[3]

This hollow truce was little regarded, and the prince continued caballing with the Fronde. But the government was not strong enough to brave the united forces of

[1] Dis. Ven., cx., 17, Sept. 21, 1649.

[2] Motteville, 296, 297. Retz, ii., 153. Le Tellier visited the prince to see if his resentment could be cooled, but he bade him tell the cardinal that he should no longer be his friend, he would no more attend the council, and instead of being the cardinal's protector as heretofore, he could be counted as his bitterest enemy. See letters published in Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 409, 411.

[3] Lenet, 197, 198. Dis. Ven., cx, 18, 21, letters cited above.

Condé, Retz, Beaufort, and their followers, and so absolute a surrender was made, that even Condé could ask no more. On October 2d Mazarin signed a written agreement, which was deposited with Molé for safe-keeping, by which Condé became almost a dictator. That a perfect understanding might exist with the prince, it recited, and that her majesty might show her affection and confidence, Mazarin promised, at her request, that no one should be appointed to any government, or to any important office at the Court or in the army, nor should any resolution be taken on any important question of state, unless the advice of Condé was first asked. His friends and servants were to be remembered when any vacancy occurred, and Mazarin promised that neither his nephew nor any of his nieces should be married unless the prince was first consulted. In consideration of this agreement Condé promised his friendship to Mazarin, and that he would serve him in his plans against all opponents.[1]

Condé had secured a great influence, but he had obtained it by the alienation of the Frondeurs, who felt that he had used them, deceived them, and abandoned them when his own interests required.[2] At his request, made to please his sister, the tabouret was granted to Mme. de Pons and to the wife of the Prince of Marcillac; while to the latter himself was given the right to enter the court of the Louvre in his carriage.[3]

Such concessions may not seem of importance, but they excited the whole nobility of France. The tabouret was a stool, and the right of the tabouret was the right to sit in the presence of the king and queen. This privilege was as much valued as the right of the Spanish grandees to

[1] Aff. Etr. Fr., 864, p. 243, Let. de Mazarin, iii., 410–412.

These agreements, reduced to writing and signed, are found in Lenet, 204, 205. Their terms were not then made public. Retz, ii., 155.

These intrigues are fully and accurately described in a Ms. memoir printed in the Journal d'Ormesson, i., 792–799. The Venetian ambassador states the results, t. cx., 29, *et passim*, and calls it a capitulation "con grande pregiudizio della Reggenza e discredito considerabile di sua Eminenza."

[3] Motteville, 304. Joly, 26. [2] Dis. Ven., cx., 29.

remain covered in their sovereign's presence, and it was claimed that it belonged only to wives of princes or of dukes. In the profuse times of the regency, honors had been scattered as freely as pensions, and now the tabouret was granted to the wife of a son of a duke, and to a lady who had only a fictitious claim to belong to the princely house of Albret. The aristocracy of France resolved to act together in this crisis. They had regarded the Fronde as a laughing war. They had been indifferent to the peace of Westphalia, and had sneered at the attempts at Parliamentary reform. They had regarded any popular cause or popular measure of as little importance as the pedigree of a Parisian shop-keeper, but they were stirred to their depths by the question of footstools. The nobles would suffer arbitrary imprisonment in the Bastille without complaint, but their souls revolted against another sitting while they stood. The whole nobility of the kingdom were invited to join in so just a cause, and a large assemblage of gentlemen, not only from Paris but from the provinces, met to consider these dangerous innovations.

A written agreement was presented by which, after reciting that as the nobles were the only true and firm support of the monarchy they must be united, they bound themselves to stand by one another in every measure of just resentment against the granting of privileges that belonged to princes, to those who were not of princely families, and against the granting of princely rank to those who were not of princely birth. Whoever deserted them in this union, should be regarded as a man without faith or honor and no gentleman. This declaration of their rights was signed by many dukes and marshals, and by a long list of the historical and noble names of France. A delegation was sent to ask from the queen protection for their privileges. They met with a friendly reception. Anne was pleased that Condé, by persisting in his demands for one or two of his friends, had brought upon himself the hostility of the whole nobility of France. She received the deputation with affability, and acceded

to their requests. The tabourets were to be withdrawn from Marcillac and Pons and from others who had improperly received them during the regency.[1] Only to those who were princes by birth should that rank be allowed, though as the rights of the Duke of Bouillon had obtained recognition from the Pope, they were reserved. With such promises the nobles were content, and the assemblage dispersed, equally satisfied with the regent and dissatisfied with the Prince of Condé.[2]

A still more serious complication engaged the attention of the government. The rentes of the Hotel de Ville were the portions of the national indebtedness which were most carefully paid. They were held in large quantities by the bourgeois of Paris, and their amount was regarded as a proof alike of the prodigality of the goverment and the wealth of the city. Many families in moderate circumstances depended for their entire income upon the payment of those rentes, and any failure reduced them at once to actual distress. They were secured by the duties upon salt, which were considered the most certain revenues of the state. It had been solemnly agreed by the farmers of those taxes, that the rentes, which were already in arrears from the disturbances the last year, should now be regularly paid. But in those disordered times, the rigorous laws which punished any evasion of the salt duty were openly violated, and contraband salt-makers were protected by the sentiment of the people. It was now autumn, the season for salting provisions, when the receipts from the gabelle were ordinarily the largest. But the government warehouses in many of the provinces, and even in the district of Paris, had but scanty sales. Bands of discharged soldiers, of deserters, and of ruined and desperate peasants, sold contraband salt at prices far below government figures. It was openly sold at the fairs, at the very church doors, like an article of ordinary merchandise.

---

[1] Aff. Etr. France, t. 867, p. 121.

[2] Montglat, 219, 221. Talon, 366–368, Motteville, 303–311. Dis. Ven. cx. 30, 37, *et passim*. Journal de Dubuisson Aubenay, Oct. 4–13.

Hanging some of the contraband dealers, and sending some to the galleys, did not discourage others, and the offenders were sometimes rescued by the mob from the officers who endeavored to arrest them.[1]

There was, perhaps, sufficient excuse for the failure of the tax farmers to pay the rentes, and the government could not help them. But the rentiers none the less excited a fierce commotion at this repeated public bankruptcy. The Parliament ordered the farmers to pay the sums agreed, but the government sought to protect them. Meetings were held at the Hotel de Ville, and twelve syndics were chosen to attend to righting the wrongs of the rentiers. When the matter was brought before the Parliament early in December, excited crowds gathered around the courts threatening violence and breeding confusion. Retz and the leading Frondeurs were active in directing this popular disturbance. The coadjutor had been profuse in benefactions among the poor, to preserve his great influence at Paris, and he now espoused the cause of the middle class on the question of rentes. Emeri had again been made superintendent of the finances, but their condition was such that his restoration was received with indifference, if not with favor.[2] He had afforded some relief to the rentiers, but it was only partial, and the feeling was such that at any sudden commotion barricades might again arise in the streets, and Paris be given over to open violence.

The Frondeurs desired that an assembly should be called of all the chambers of the Parliament, for thus they could most easily obtain the coöperation of that body in violent proceedings. During the autumn the judges had shown little inclination to favor the measures of those who desired new turmoils, and their coöperation was much desired.[3] Acting with the Parliament, those who otherwise

[1] *Gazette*, 1649, *passim*. Talon, 368-9. Ordinance, July 6, 1649.

[2] Dis. Ven., cx., 68, 69.

[3] Dis. Ven., cx., 49, 82, *et passim*. "Li malcontenti non hanno quel seguito ne quell' applauso che sarebbe necessario a suoi torbidi fini."—Dis., Oct. 26th.

would be regarded as seditious tribunes of the people, would become the defenders of the widow and orphan.[1] To create an excitement that should compel such an assembly, a fictitious scheme of violence was concocted. Wise, possibly, after its failure Retz claims that he advised against the plan.[2]

It was decided that a feigned attempt at assassination should be made upon some one who had been sufficiently active in the public interests to arouse popular excitement. It was not easy, however, to find a person who was willing to expose himself to a pretended assassination that might prove a real one. Among the syndics of the rentiers, one Guy Joly, a devoted follower of Retz, had become the leader through his activity and zeal. He now said that if his position as syndic would make an attack upon him of sufficient importance to excite the public, he was ready to expose himself. An adroit and daring adventurer, called D'Estainville, was chosen for the assailant, and he and Joly went to a friend's house for practice in assassination. Joly's cloak and doublet were adjusted, and D'Estainville practised firing at them, and with great accuracy sent a bullet through them, where it would apparently injure the wearer, but would not kill him. Joly's arm was then bruised by flints to give the appearance of an injury by a ball. On the morning of the 11th of December, as Joly's carriage passed along the Rue des Bernardines, with its occupant carefully placed in position, D'Estainville stepped up and fired at him. Then turning, he at once made his escape, so that it was impossible to discover who had done the deed. The ball passed safely through the carriage, but Joly, with his pierced mantle and his bruised arm, was at once taken to a physician. All had been so skilfully arranged that even the surgeon was deceived, and the syndic's wounds were duly dressed and poulticed.[3]

---

[1] Retz, ii., 166.

[2] *Ib.*, 166. Joly, page 28, says the coadjutor favored the plan, and he certainly acquiesced and assisted in it when it was decided upon.

[3] This whole scheme and its execution is described by Joly himself. Joly, 28, 29. See also Reg. Hotel de Ville, ii., 70. Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 429. Dis. Ven., cx., 93, 94, 99.

In the meantime a rumor that Joly, the patriotic syndic, had been assassinated spread through the city. The rentiers flocked to the Tournelle demanding justice, and a disturbed session of the Parliament was held. But a real or pretended attempt on the life of a greater personage eclipsed the excitement raised over the gallant syndic. When the news of the assault on Joly was first noised about Paris, the Marquis of La Boulaye, a nobleman of small parts, and holding a subordinate position under Beaufort, was so affected by the frenzy of the times that he endeavored to raise an insurrection. He went through the streets with a handful of followers crying out "To arms! The Court has murdered the syndic and endeavored to murder M. de Beaufort." But the endeavor fell flat. A few shots were fired, and a few bakers marked up the price of their loaves on the possibility of trouble.[1]

There was no uprising and there were no barricades. This fiasco left La Boulaye in a position which would have been ludicrous, had it not been dangerous. He sought perhaps to make his peace with the Court by attempting an assault upon the Prince of Condé. Condé was warned of such a danger, and he sent his carriage with some of his lackeys where he himself was expected. It was fired into on the evening of the eleventh on the Pont Neuf, and one of the lackeys in the carriage following was injured. The city was already in a turmoil, and the excitement rose to a fever height at the news of the attempted assassination of the Prince of Condé. License and burlesque went together even to the verge of tragedy, and it was impossible to decide whether this was an attempt to murder the first prince of the blood, or only another farce. The Frondeurs claimed that Mazarin had devised this plan, and by calling it a plot of theirs, intended to inflame the prince against them. Others said that the shots were discharged by some drunken butchers, and were not intended for the prince. There is nothing to show that the leading Fron-

[1] Joly, 30. Retz, ii., 168. Suite du Journal du Parlement, 3–5.

deurs knew of the matter, but they were accused of it, and Condé believed that Retz and his associates had formed a plan to murder him. Whoever planned the attack, or whether it was simply an accident or a disturbance by a few ruffians, Mazarin encouraged him in this belief, intending to cause dissensions that would destroy the possibility of any further alliance between Condé and the Fronde.[1] The cardinal manifested the liveliest resentment at such an attack upon his friend and the prop of the state, while the prince himself, who was always violent and indiscreet, fell into the snare that was laid for him, and solicited his friends to avenge this plot against his life.[2]

The attempted assassination was at once brought before the Parliament, and Retz, Beaufort, and Broussel were charged with instigating an attempt upon the life of the Prince of Condé. Even in this time of suspicion and excitement there was nothing to show that they had any part in an act equally criminal and impolitic, and the charges were supported only by the evidence of witnesses unworthy of credence. One of them, Retz claimed, was a man condemned to be hung at Pau. Another had been broken on the wheel in effigy at Le Mans. A third had been convicted of perjury before the Tournelle, and the others were arrant blacklegs.[3]

These brevet witnesses, as they were called, gained so little credence that Talon and Bignon, who were advocates-general, refused to report any accusations to the Parliament upon their testimony. But the procureur general,

[1] "Salutem ex inimicis nostris," he wrote in his diary of this assaault, Carnet de Tours, 51.

[2] Joly, 30. Retz ii., 169, 172. Motteville, 318. Journal d' Ormesson, i., 782–4. Lenet, 208. Mazarin is charged by Joly and Rochefoucauld with devising a pretended assault upon Condé, and such a thing is hinted by Retz. His Carnets written at the time, for his own use, "Carnet imprimé de Tours," 30–42, seem to be inconsistent with any such idea. Lenet, page 208, says Mazarin explained the whole affair to him, and that he spoke of it as a pretended attack. He wrote in this Carnet, p. 38, of the attack on Condé: "Cela rend l'affayer plus noyre et plus punissable." A man does not make such an entry of his own act in a memorandum intended for his own eye.

[3] Retz, ii., 183. Journal du Parlement, 11, *et seq.*

pressed by the Court and Condé, and strongly supported by President Molé, who in this matter showed a zeal hardly to be reconciled with judicial impartiality, brought before the body charges against Beaufort, Retz, and Broussel.[1] They were formally accused of having joined in a plot to murder Condé, and they were ordered to appear before the body, that they might be heard in their own behalf.[2] Even though they were innocent of the offence charged, the position of the accused was by no means free from danger.

The attempt to excite a popular rising by the assault on Joly had proved a fiasco, and the leading Frondeurs were subjected to the odium and ridicule that comes from failure. Retz and Beaufort were unscrupulous men, and it was not incredible that they should have planned to rid themselves of their enemy. They could easily have cajoled Broussel to give the appearance of assent to their designs. In an excited state of public feeling judgments are based upon other things than testimony, and condemnations are in the air if not in the evidence.[3] After innumerable plots unpunished, it would not be strange that they should be condemned for one which they had not planned. The influence of the Court and of Condé was exercised to the utmost. The Duke of Orleans attended the sessions of the Parliament, Condé's friends and servants demanded vengeance, and over a thousand followers of the prince are said to have thronged the halls when the cause came up for consideration.[4] The judges were equally solicited by the friends of the accused. The latter sent even into the provinces to bring up their retainers to overawe the court, or to engage in any bloody mêlée that might arise.[5]

---

[1] Molé claimed that the prosecution would fail unless it was pushed with rapidity, while public feeling was excited.—Carnet de Tours, 50.

[2] Talon, 372, 373. Journal d' Ormesson, 784–9. Carnet de Tours, 39, 50. "Il faut aiguilloner le procureur general, car il va lentement."

[3] "Tout le peuple crie justice et rigueur, estant persuadé de la verité et de quelque chose de plus."—Carnet de Tours, 61.

[4] Dis. Ven., cx., 104.

[5] Retz, ii., 182–196.

The accused made a counter-assault upon Molé, and some of the members of the Inquests declared that for 30,000 scudi in the rentes he had betrayed his associates, and demanded that he should not be allowed to sit as judge in these trials.[1]

On January 4th it was decided by a vote of ninety-eight to sixty-two that Molé was entitled to continue to act.[2] Many of the judges absented themselves to avoid voting upon this question, while the political future was so uncertain. The investigation continued during the early part of January, 1650, but in the meantime the cup of Condé's offences was full, and the hour had at last come when his pride and his selfishness left him exposed to a sudden and disastrous overthrow. In the alarm which followed the events of December 11th, Retz and his associates tried to check the indignation of the Prince of Condé. They endeavored, both with him and Mme. de Longueville, to prove their innocence, and they offered to make a firm alliance against the cardinal. But Condé was irritated and defiant, and Mme. de Longueville was unfriendly to Retz.[3]

It was claimed that Retz had informed Longueville of the conduct of his wife, but the coadjutor declared he would have been incapable of such an act.[4] As there was no hope of reconciliation from that quarter, the Frondeurs were driven to seek an alliance with Mazarin against a person who had made himself odious to all. Such an alliance the cardinal had already contemplated, and his enemies of the Fronde had become less hateful to him than his protector, the Prince of Condé. It was impossible that Mazarin should be willing to remain in the condition of subservience to Condé, in which he was placed by the agreement of October. "I think only to serve him in every way and every thing," Mazarin wrote in his private notes, "with a

[1] Some of the witnesses had included Molé among those who were aimed at by the plots of the conspirators, and it was claimed that his personal interest rendered it improper for him to act as a judge.

[2] Ormesson, 789–801. Journal du Parlement, January 4, 1650.

[3] Rochefoucauld, 158.

[4] Carnet of Tours, 1, 2.

resignation without example, that, having every thing as he desires, he may assist in restoring the royal authority." "As for my nieces," he says again, "I renounce all marriages. I have drawn upon myself ill-will, and I will put them in a convent." [1]

To Val de Grace they were accordingly sent, and the marriage with Mercœur was indefinitely postponed. In the notes in which Mazarin entered, with painful persistence, the abuse of himself that reached his ears from so many quarters, he writes: "Mme. de Montbazon says the prince hates the cardinal to the utmost, talking of him as of a slave who could refuse him nothing, and whom he will send off when he desires." [2] Condé had at various times insulted Mazarin in the council, and he delighted to boast of the affronts he had inflicted on a man who was much more than his equal in ability.[3]

While Mazarin yielded with marvellous facility to any press of circumstances, buying, surrendering, flying, no one was more acute and indefatigable in guiding events as he wished. He used every effort to prevent an alliance between the prince and the Frondeurs, and as he had availed himself of Condé against the Fronde, he was now willing to avail himself of the Fronde against Condé.

Overtures for such a combination were made by that veteran intriguer, Mme. de Chevreuse. After the peace of St. Germain she had returned to Paris, and through Retz she was in the closest relations with the leaders of the Fronde. But she showed an inclination to preserve good terms with the Court against which she had intrigued so long, and she soon became a valued adviser of Mazarin. Years of exile and of disappointment had cooled the flames of opposition in her heart. She could no longer lead dukes and princes captive by her beauty, and she sighed for the rest and comfort which were insured by

[1] Carnets, xiii., 76, 77. [2] Carnet of Tours, 9.

[3] Many of Condé's remarks of this sort, which savored much more of the ill-bred bully than of the statesman, are reported by Morosini to his government. Dis. Ven., cx., 80, 89, etc. "M. le Prince, qui m' avayt offensé de gayeté de cœur": Mazarin said in his notes. Carnets, xii., 121.

friendly relations with the government.[1] To Mme. de Longueville, who was still young, beautiful, and romantic, she left the diversified rôle of a princess-errant.

The influence of Mme. de Chevreuse among the Frondeurs was increased by the fact that her daughter was now the mistress of the coadjutor. The mother had approved of this intrigue, even if she had not devised it as a means of political power. She confided to Mazarin, that she held the coadjutor by means of her daughter, who had given him her love and turned him from that he had for Mme. de Gueméné.[2]

To this affection Retz was for some time constant, with occasional relapses, which the prelate describes with great particularity. Mme. de Montbazon, if his statement is accurate, endeavored to break the alliance. "Tell the true reason that you will not leave Paris," said the beauty to the archbishop. "You cannot quit your nymphs." Then she continued, she could not see why he should amuse himself with an old woman, who was more wicked than the devil, and a young one who was more foolish than the mother was bad.[3]

This beautiful and immoral woman was herself a power in politics, and the cardinal endeavored to obtain her assistance in the alliance he desired. She controlled Beaufort, and many others paid tribute to her charms. When the Marquis of Hocquincourt, who was Governor of Péronne, decided to join the forces of that city with the Fronde, he is said to have written to Mme. de Montbazon that Péronne yielded to the fairest of the fair, thus sending treason in a madrigal. In fact, most of the intrigues and phases of the Fronde turned upon amours, and roundelays and pasquinades were its diplomatic correspondence. Retz said of Mme. de Montbazon that he had

[1] Carnets, xii., 117, 118, *et pas.*

[2] Lettres de Mazarin à la Reine, 16. Retz, who discusses the character of his lady-loves with the same cynical, if not brutal, frankness with which he discusses his relations with them, says that Mlle. de Chevreuse had beauty, but was naturally silly to a ridiculous extent.—Retz, i., 261.

[3] Retz, ii., 173, 174.

never known any one who in vice preserved so little respect for virtue, and Beaufort who was not disturbed by her gallantry, was in despair when he found her eating meat on Fridays.[1] She was now treated with consideration by the regent and Mazarin. Her daughter received a tabouret, and she herself had a substantial pension from the crown. Both she and Mme. de Chevreuse were inclined to make terms with the regent, and through them Retz and Beaufort could be moved as lovers as well as politicians.[2]

Condé had continued to make himself odious to the regent and her minister. He had contrived to outrage the queen not only as a sovereign, but as a woman. The Marquis of Jarzé, who had already figured in the broils of the year, and who was wholly devoted to Condé, flattered himself with the delusion that he could excite in Anne of Austria sentiments of personal attachment. The prince was believed to have encouraged this hope, which, if it had been well founded, would have deprived Mazarin of the hold he had on power through the queen's affection.

The minister was vigilant to discover such plans. In his Carnets he has written down the words which Anne was to use, in order publicly to dispel this folly. "The queen might say before the princes and the others: 'I should be wrong now to complain of anything, having a gallant so well made as Jarzé, only I fear to lose him some day, for he will be taken to the mad-house.' * * * Then, if he should have the effrontery to again present himself, she could say to him: "Ah, M. Jarzé, do you find me to your taste? I never thought to have such good fortune.' * * * And if he made any answer, she could say. 'If you were not a fool you would be thrown out of the window. I command you to retire and be doctored.'"[3] The queen was the instrument of the minister, who put the words into her mouth. Almost with these very expressions she burst one day upon the unhappy Jarzé, who retired covered with shame to have

[1] *Ibid.*, 174.

[2] Carnets, xiii., 111, 112, 115, *et pas.*

[3] Carnets, xiii., 95, 96.

his open discomfiture discussed not only in the Court, but in the streets and alleys of Paris. It even reached, as a precious morsel of gossip, the ears of remote provincials.[1] Notwithstanding this rebuke by the queen, Condé insisted that Jarzé should still be received at Court, and he forced upon Anne the society of a man who, she thought, had insulted her.[2] The regent dared not refuse, but no Spanish woman was ever capable of cherishing a more enduring resentment for such an affront.

Another act showed Condé's resolution to render his power independent of the crown. Havre was one of the few places in Normandy which was still in hands friendly to the goverment. Mme. d'Aiguillon held it as guardian for her nephew, the young Duke of Richelieu. This young man saw much of Mme. de Pons, the intimate friend of Mme. de Longueville; but his aunt did not suspect that her nephew would be attracted by a middle-aged widow. Mme. de Pons, however, angled for the young duke, and she was encouraged in her plans by Mme. de Longueville, who promised Condé's protection. Richelieu was ensnared, and the marriage was secretly celebrated at a chateau, belonging to the Duchess of Longueville, and was announced to the Court the day after Christmas.[3] The marriage was at once followed by an endeavor of Richelieu to seize Havre for himself, and Havre in his hands would be subject to Condé.

This marriage and its evident design excited irritation. Mme. d'Aiguillon bewailed to the queen the rape of her nephew by an elderly widow, neither rich nor beautiful, whom the courtiers called the homely Helen.[4] The government was alarmed by the prospect of losing the strongest place in Normandy, and by Condé's indifference to its authority.

---

[1] Motteville, 313, 315. Sup. au Journal d' Ormesson, 780. The event is related with various details by all the memoir writers.

[2] Dis. Ven., cx., 80., Dec. 7th. Carnet de Tours, 3–5.

[3] "Persuaso e incantato da Principe di Condé," says Morosini, cx., 111.

[4] Carnet de Tours, 71, 72. Motteville, 319, 320. See Aff. Etr. France, 870, 32.

But Condé's position was now such that it was no longer necessary to submit to his despotism and insolence. The prince, Mme. de Chevreuse said, was strong among the weak, but he was weak among the strong. The nobility and the other princes were incensed against him. She promised to answer for Beaufort, the coadjutor, and all their party, if the queen would give them her entire confidence.[1]

Retz was accordingly sent for early in January, 1650, and he visited the regent in profound secrecy. She told him her grievances against the prince, and mingled with them her sorrow at the trials of her minister. "The poor cardinal," she constantly repeated. She offered to withdraw the nomination to the cardinalate from La Rivière, and give it to the coadjutor.[2] Mazarin complained bitterly of La Rivière, as false to him and too faithless to be true even to himself.[3] The minister, however, had not been inferior to the abbé in duplicity, for with the official nomination, he is said to have sent a private letter to Rome, that would have obtained for Rivière the yellow hat of a heretic rather than the red hat of a cardinal.[4]

Retz disclaimed any desire to bargain for honors for himself, but suitable compensation was fixed for the chief Frondeurs, and it was agreed that there should be no public clamor at the arrest of the Prince of Condé. Orleans had also to be gained, and he was discreetly weaned from his favorite. Mme. de Chevreuse pointed out to him that La Rivière, for his own interests, had neglected those of his master, and that he was devoted to the House of Condé, on account of his consuming desire to become a cardinal. Condé had offended the duke by his imperious manners, and his great power excited Orleans' fears. The Duke of Orleans, declared Mazarin, could be the happiest

[1] Carnet, xii., 118–122. "Le coadjuteur, Beaufort, et tout le party seroyt entièrment á moy, si je le volys recevoir."—Carnet of Tours, 60, Dec'r.

[2] Morosini, in speaking of this, says that Retz: "tra li malcontenti é certamente il solo che ha talenti."—cx., 109.

[3] Complaints of Rivière are found, Carnet de Tours, 19–27, 77, etc.

[4] Retz, ii., 197, 203. The Venetian minister wrote in June it was reported that Rivière offered Donna Olympia 100,000 scudi for his promotion, and Mazarin offered her 200,000 to prevent it.—Dis. Ven., cix., 83.

man in the world, enjoy the king's confidence, pay the expenses of his establishment, make peace, and be adored by the people, but he should lose no time.[1] Thus skilfully plied, the timid and fickle prince was easily cajoled and frightened into an agreement to abandon both Condé and La Rivière. On January 16th, Mazarin signed a paper with Condé, by which he agreed again that he would never depart from the prince's interests, but would remain attached to him before all and against all.[2] Two days later, on the 18th, all was ready for Condé's arrest and imprisonment. Rumors of his danger had been carried to his ears, but he was too confident of his position to give credence to them. On January 17th, one of his friends warned him of the peril, but the prince replied that was the seventeenth folly that had been talked to him on that day. It had been decided, however, that Condé, Conti, and Longueville should not attend the Louvre together, so that the three great members of their house could not be arrested at once, but on the 18th, Mazarin said that the council would consider the reversion of the royal lieutenancy for Normandy, which Longueville had solicited for a friend, and also matters of importance and of interest to all. Shortly after dinner on that day, the three arrived at the Louvre. The regent was in bed feigning a headache, and waiting with anxiety for the result of the perilous enterprise. Condé met Mazarin, who conversed with him with his customary affability. The prince, as usual, was full of complaints. The Parliament was protecting his enemies; Orleans was cold in his support, and La Rivière was treacherous and using his influence in behalf of the Frondeurs. He talked loudly, and the sounds reached the queen, who imagined he was protesting against his arrest. La Rivière now arrived, and the cardinal turned and took him into his chamber, leaving Condé, Conti, and Longueville in the gallery with some others of the council. All being now ready, Anne arose from her bed, gave the order of arrest to Guitaut, captain

[1] Carnet of Tours, 74, etc.

[2] Mss., cited in Retz, ed. Champolion, ii., 206.

of the guards, and retired with the young king to her oratory, to pray for the success of her undertaking. Guitaut entered the gallery, and speaking to Condé, said: "I have orders to arrest you, the Prince of Conti, and M. de Longueville." "Me, M. Guitaut," cried the prince; "you arrest me? In the name of God, go to the queen and say I ask to speak with her." [1]

The captain obeyed, and Condé, turning to the others, said: "The queen arrests you and me also. I confess this astonishes me, who have always served the king so well, and who believed myself so assured of the friendship of the cardinal."

Guitaut now returned, saying that the queen's orders were explicit for their arrest. They accordingly followed the guards, and went by a back passage into the gardens of the Louvre, where they entered the carriage prepared for them. Some of the gendarmes of the king stood at the gate of the garden as they passed. "This is not the battle of Lens," said the prince to one of them, but no one answered. The prisoners were driving rapidly over the back ways to avoid passing through the chief streets of the city, when the carriage was overthrown. Condé sprang out, and could have escaped, but he was stopped by Miossens, a lieutenant of the guards. "Miossens" said the prince, "if you wish, see what you can do." "I am grieved to be forced to this," answered the lieutenant, "but I must obey the king and the queen." The prisoners were then safely carried to Vincennes, and there confined. No beds were ready for them, and they spent the night playing cards. Condé bore his overthrow with better grace than he had his prosperity, but Longueville was becoming old, and he was cast down by the prospect of imprisonment. "That is a good haul," said the Duke of Orleans, when he heard of the arrest. "They have taken the lion, the monkey, and the fox." [2]

---

[1] Brienne, page 124, says Condé sent the chancellor to inquire of the queen. Mme. de Motteville says he sent Guitaut, and her account is fuller, and probably written nearer the time of the occurrence. So, although Brienne was a witness, it is possible that his recollection was in fault in that respect.

[2] Joly, 33.

Retz fulfilled his pledge that no disturbance should follow the arrest. Indeed, Condé was so unpopular that his downfall was greeted with universal joy. Bonfires blazed before the houses of the bourgeois, and they fired their rusty arquebuses into the air. The reports reached the prisoners at Vincennes, and when Condé was told they were firing in honor of his arrest, he was filled with amazement.[1]

"I have something of consequence to tell you," Mazarin had said to La Rivière, as he led him into his closet. When the abbé heard of the arrest of the prince, he treated it at first as a fable, but when he found that such a step had been agreed to by the Duke of Orleans, without consulting him, he knew that his power was gone. "I am a lost man," said the unhappy favorite. He visited the duke and tried to show him that he was wrong in distrusting his fidelity. But Mme. de Chevreuse had persuaded the duke that the vision of a cardinal's hat had turned the abbé's head, and Orleans was deaf to his entreaties. The fallen favorite was ordered to retire to one of his livings, and his expectations of becoming a cardinal vanished forever. For six years he had controlled the wishes, beliefs, and actions of the Duke of Orleans. He had, at least, large wealth to console him, in his retirement, for the ruin of his hopes and the loss of his greatness. He was said to have fifty thousand livres of rentes and two millions of ready money.[2]

---

[1] For an account of the arrest of the princes, see Motteville, 325–331. Aff. Etr. Fr., 870. p. 7. Carnet, xiv., 116–118. Nemours, 629–632. Journal d' Ormesson, 803–5. Despatch of Mazarin, Jan'y 22, 1650. Montglat, 225–227. Brienne, 123–125. Montpensier, 61, 62. Talon, 379–389. The accounts of Mme. de Motteville and of Brienne, who were present at the arrest, are the fullest and most accurate.

[2] Motteville, 334. Talon, 380. Carnets, xiii., pages 2–4. He died in 1675, and left 100 crowns to whoever would write the best epitaph upon him. La Monnaye wrote this :

"Ci git un très grand personnage,
Qui fut d'un illustre lignage,
Qui posséda mille vertus,
Qui ne trompa jamais, qui fut toujours sage.—
Je n'en dirai pas davantage ;
C'est trop mentir pour cent écus."

CHAPTER XII.

THE REVOLTS FOR THE RELEASE OF CONDÉ.

THE arrest of the princes was followed by an attempt to seize the most important of their followers, but they escaped and raised the standard of rebellion wherever they possessed any local influence. Mme. de Longueville was now recognized as one of the chief political leaders, and commendation of her political skill had become sweeter to her than the praise of her "beaux yeux," to which she had listened so long. She fled at once into Normandy in order to avoid arrest, and endeavored to lead that province into insurrection.

But Normandy was weary of disorder and could not be charmed into turmoil even by so beautiful an intriguer. Richelieu was negotiating with the Court about Havre, and Rouen was cold to the cause. Mme. de Longueville fled to Dieppe, and endeavored to inflame the citizens against the cardinal. But they told her they loved their quiet, and suffered no disturbance from Mazarin's rule. They would as willingly serve him as any one else. The chateau which she occupied was hedged in by troops, and she was in danger of capture. Disappointed in all her hopes, but with her courage unabated, the wandering princess prepared to fly still farther.

She wished to embark in a fisherman's smack, hoping to meet some vessel for Holland, but, as the boatman was assisting her aboard, the wind being furious and the sea very high, he lost his hold, and she fell into the ocean. She was rescued with difficulty, and was warmed and revived at the little hamlet of Pourville. When the princess

had become a saint instead of a politician, she commemorated this terrible night and her rescue by sending on each anniversary of it 200 fagots to the curé of Pourville, to be used in warming the poor.[1]

It was now impossible to go by water, on account of the fierceness of the storm, and she obtained some horses, rode all night, and at last found shelter at a gentleman's residence. In his house she lay concealed some days, and finally disguising herself as a man, she engaged passage on an English ship, and reached Holland in safety.[2] There she was joined by Turenne, who, influenced by his brother, and fascinated by her, now entered into treasonable alliances with Spain. But, as it was said, the crime of high treason was fashionable at that time.[3]

Marcillac, who had now become by his father's death the Duke of Rochefoucauld, also attempted a movement on behalf of the imprisoned princes, and rallied about him a large body of gentlemen of Poitou. He sent frequent accounts of his progress to Mme. de Longueville, and a desire to shine in her eyes seems to have been his chief motive.[4]

Mme. de Longueville and Mme. de Chevreuse could overthrow ten states, Mazarin said, and he complained to the Spanish minister of this development of female activity in politics. "You," said the cardinal to the Spaniard, "are happy. You have, like every one else, two sorts of women, plenty of coquettes and a few good women. The one wishes to please her gallants, and the other her husband, and they have no desires but for luxury and vanity. They do not know how to write except to lovers or confessors, and their heads would be turned if you talked politics to them. But our women, whether prudes or gallants, young or old, wise or foolish, wish to have a hand in every thing.

[1] Hist. du Parlement de Normandie, v., 449,

[2] Motteville, 335–337. Nemours, 619, 632, 633. Lettres de Colbert, i., 5.

[3] Motteville, 192. For these transactions in Normandy, see despatches of Mazarin to Le Tellier, published in appendices to Mem. de Retz, ii., iii. Dis. Ven., cx., 133, *et pas.*, and Let. de Mazarin, iii., 456–491.

[4] Lenet, 223.

A woman will not go to rest until she has talked over the affairs of state with her husband or her lover. They wish to know every thing, and, what is worse, they wish to manage and embroil every thing. We have three, Mme. de Chevreuse, Mme. de Longueville and the Princess Palatine, who cause us every day more confusion than ever there was in Babylon." [1] "The most important intrigues in this kingdom," Richelieu had written, "are usually begun and conducted by women."[2]

While these attempts at insurrection were made, the Frondeurs, the old Fronde as they were called, to distinguished them from the new Fronde of Condé's followers, proceeded to reap the fruits of their alliance with Mazarin. They did not receive all that they wished, but they received something. The seals were taken from Chancellor Seguier and given again to Chateauneuf. It was seventeen years since Richelieu had taken them from him, because he had yielded himself to the counsels of Mme. de Chevreuse. After so many years of disappointment and disgrace, he was at last restored by the influence of the woman whose attractions had caused his overthrow.[3] He was now over 70, but years had not cooled his ambition, and his friends were exultant, hoping that since he was again in the service of the government, it would not be long before he would replace the cardinal. But the queen informed her confidants that they were deceived who thought he would ever be more than he then was.[4] Mazarin greeted his possible successor affably, and treated all the party with attention, saying he found it very agreeable to have become himself a Frondeur.[5] He proclaimed

[1] Lenet, 254.

[2] Mém. de Richelieu, xxiii., 229. The cardinal wrote this in 1637, when he was in danger from the hostility of Mme. de Hautefort, to Mlle. de la Fayette. The Venetian ambassador wrote his government in 1652: "In questo paese prevale l'autorita e l'entratura delle dame anco nelle cose più serie e più importante."—Dis. Ven., cxv., 92.

[3] Dis. Ven., cxi., 11.

[4] Motteville, 338.

[5] Joly, 35. "De quitter tout et de se fayre frondeur," Mazarin said of his conduct. Carnet de Tours, 82.

his desire to advance Retz's friends, who were now his own, but advised moderation in promising them places of importance.[1]

On account of Beaufort's garrulity, the plot for the arrest had been concealed from him till immediately before its execution. He and Mme. de Montbazon complained that they had been trifled with in this matter, but Retz, to show that he had been mindful of their interests in the bargain with the Court, pulled from his pocket the reversion of the admiralty which had been granted to Beaufort. The duke embraced the faithful coadjutor, and Mme. de Montbazon kissed him five or six times, very tenderly.[2]

A pension of 3,000 livres was given to a son of Broussel.[3] The accusations against Beaufort, Retz, and Broussel were at once dismissed by the Parliament. The followers of the prince endeavored to obtain assistance from that body, but the Frondeurs were firm in their alliance with Mazarin, and defeated these efforts. Le Coigneux, a member of the Inquests, demanded for the princes an examination or a trial, and protested against holding them without legal charges in indefinite confinement. Such a right had been demanded by the Parliament, in 1648, and had been granted by the edict of October in that year. But French politics at this time turned on persons and not on principles. The right, which is the most valuable check on arbitrary power, was viewed with indifference when it was invoked for an opponent, even by those who had most loudly clamored for it. Had the men excited no personal interest, Prynne's ears might have been cropped in France, and Hampden been arrested for not paying illegal taxes, and no one would have murmured. In France, Wilkes could have been outlawed, fined, and sent to prison, and the feeling that the oppression of one man is the oppression of all men would not there have made an infamous profligate the most popular man in the kingdom, All Paris could be roused to tumult by a mob, crying,

[1] Let. de Mazarin, iii., 467–8, Feb. 7th. [2] Retz, ii., 235, 236.
[3] Carnets, xiv., 21.

"No Mazarin!" but no continued resolution and enthusiasm enforced a popular right or defeated an illegal tax. Le Coigneux was hissed down by the Parliament, and his proposition was rejected with universal contempt.[1]

Apart from the disturbances threatened in Normandy and Poitou, Bouillon had embarked in the cause of the princes. Champagne was ready for revolt, while in Guienne the long smouldering discontent with Épernon made it easy for the partisans of Condé to excite serious trouble. Mazarin resolved to quiet these revolts in person, and on February 1st he left Paris with the regent and the young king. Normandy was easily pacified. There was indeed no serious disturbance there. The royal party was received at Rouen with great enthusiasm. By the latter part of February, Mme. de Longueville had sailed for Holland, and the province was entirely peaceful.[2]

There was little difficulty in overcoming the insurrection in Burgundy, though Condé had been its governor. Mazarin and the king proceeded there, and the siege and capture of Bellegarde ensured the tranquillity of the province.[3] But the troubles in Guienne were more serious. The Parliament was irritated by the insulting conduct of Épernon, and the people were distressed by the taxes.[4] It was there that the friends of the prince went for assistance. Condé's cause was vigorously espoused by his mother and wife. His wife had been forced upon him by the greed of his father and the ambition of Richelieu. He long cherished thoughts of repudiating her, and such plans

[1] Motteville, 340.

[2] Let. de Mazarin, iii., 456–491. Carnet 14, *pas.* in early portion. Lettres de Colbert, i., 1–8. Among the appointments by the government, Pierre Corneille, the poet, was appointed syndic of the States of Normandy. Mazarin received from the queen 300,000 livres, to recompense him for his services there and for his loss from the pillage of his effects at Paris. Dis. Ven., cxi., 1. The same despatch of March 1, says: "In pochi giorni riddotta tutta la Normandia ad una vera obbedienza." A pamphleteer complains that they appointed Pierre Corneille, who knew well enough how to make verses for the theatre, but was said to be ill fitted to manage matters of state. Suite du Journal du Parlement, 57.

[3] Let. de Mazarin, iii., 494–536.

[4] Dis. Ven., cxi., 45.

had yielded to an ill-disguised neglect and contempt. But in the hour of her husband's adversity the niece of Richelieu showed herself no unworthy consort for a Condé.

The dowager princess was ordered to retire to Montrond or Bourges, but instead of obeying, she complained to the Parliament of the treatment with which she was threatened, little befitting her age and quality, and inflicted upon her for the crime of being the mother of two princes. She asked for an asylum in Paris, where she might in retirement pray for her unfortunate family. While the judges were not wholly disinclined to listen to her complaint, they recommended to her obedience.[1]

At Chantilly, however, active measures were planned on behalf of the imprisoned princes. There were carried on together intrigues of diplomacy and gallantry, the mingling of politics and frivolity which marked the period of the Fronde. At Chantilly, writes one of the most active of Condé's followers, after prayers in the chapel, every one retired to the apartment of the princess dowager. There were games, singing, and conversations about the intrigues of the Court and affairs of gallantry. Some read the letters from the Duchess of Longueville and the last lampoons on Mazarin, or they discussed and revised others which had not yet been published. Pamphlets, sonnets, elegies, rhymes, and puzzles exercised the witty. By day they wandered through the avenues of the park or along the lake singing, writing verses, or reading romances, and even the jealousies of the young ladies over their lovers only gave zest to the pleasures of existence.[2]

But the release of the princes could not be obtained solely by laying plots in such agreeable surroundings. At midnight on May 9th, Condé's wife left Montrond, where she had retired by the queen's orders, and with her son, the Duke of Enghien, a child of seven, and a small body of followers, she started to rouse the southern provinces

[1] Talon, 387–389. Motteville, 360. Dis. Ven., cxi., 64–5. Suite du Journal, 68–74.

[2] Lenet, 230–1.

in her husband's behalf. She travelled amid dangers and hardships, over rough and perilous roads, and joined the Duke of Bouillon at Turenne. There she was received with an enthusiasm worthy her courage and rank. The firing of cannon greeted her as she entered the town followed by a body of cavalry and nobles. One hundred covers were set in the great hall where she dined. The noise of the feast grew furious as they drank the toast to the Prince of Condé. Some drank standing, some on their knees, but all with head bared and sword in hand pledged the prince's restoration, until many, incoherent, but still faithful, were laid among the bottles under the table.[1]

The princess rapidly gathered a considerable force, and many of the influential nobles in Southern France joined her cause. By the last of May she appeared before Bordeaux. That city and the province of Guienne were ready to aid any party which was hostile to the government. Épernon's cruelties and arbitrary rule made him hated by all, and this hatred was reflected upon the government which supported him. His removal had been repeatedly asked, but Mazarin was unwilling to deprive of so great an office the father of a possible husband for one of his nieces. It was justly charged that the cardinal sacrificed the interests of this great province to the desire of obtaining the Duke of Candale as a nephew.[2]

It is certain that Épernon was allowed to remain in a place where he increased the dangers to which the government was exposed. A bourgeoise named Nanon of Lartigue, of little beauty or wit, but having the skill to charm the proud duke by feeling or feigning a profound admiration for him, and by treating him as a great prince, had become the mistress of his actions. He was said to have bestowed on her a fortune of two million livres, and

[1] *Ibid.*, 264–272.

[2] Lenet, 300. The well-informed Venetian ambassador speaks of Mazarin's desire for this alliance and the negotiations pending for it, and says that by that Épernon secured Mazarin's support. Dis. Ven., cxi., 262. "La grande disposizione di sua Eminenza a questo partito," etc.

the scandal of her influence with the duke and of the wealth and power heaped upon one who had sprung from an inferior position, added to the hatred felt for Épernon by the people of Guienne.[1]

It was resolved to admit the princess into the city of Bordeaux. The people broke open the gates, swearing they would kill any one who opposed her entrance, and she was received by a great multitude, who pressed eagerly to kiss the hand of the young Enghien, showered flowers upon the mother, and rent the air with cries of "Long live the King, and the Princess of Condé!" mingled with execrations against Mazarin and Epernon. On June first, the princess took her son to the Parliament, followed by a multitude of eager sympathizers. She demanded from the judges protection from the violence of Mazarin, and assistance for the prince and his unhappy house, so unjustly persecuted. The young duke knelt on the ground, and said to the court: "Act as a father to me, Messieurs, for the Cardinal Mazarin has taken my own father from me." It was voted amid sobs and acclamations that the princess and her son should remain under the protection of the city, while the king was petitioned to lend a favorable ear to her remonstrances. A proclamation was issued in the the name of Claire Clemence de Maille Brézé, wife of the Prince of Condé, Duke of Enghien, Châteauroux, Montmorenci, Albret, and Fronsac, governor of Burgundy, Bresse, and Berri, asking aid for a prince who had so often exposed his life in the service of the king and the welfare of the people, and who was now kept by Mazarin in chains and rigorous captivity.[2]

The princess and her supporters at once turned to Spain for assistance. A Spanish envoy was received at Bordeaux, and help was demanded from him for a princess overwhelmed with misfortune, and for her infant son. But the Spanish wished to furnish aid in proportion to

[1] Lenet, 267.

[2] Lenet, 276, 284. "Histoire veritable de tout ce qui s'est fait en Guyenne pendant la guerre de Bordeaux," 1–7.

the strength of the party which could be organized in Condé's behalf. This was not satisfactory, for the most of those from whom help was expected in Bordeaux or out of it, were only ready to act in the hope of a recompense proportionate to their services, and funds sufficient to excite their activity must come from Spain. A treaty was, however, signed, and representatives were sent to Madrid, but except some very moderate sums of money, the princess received little help from that government.

But the populace continued eager in her behalf, praising her courage and attractive manners, and heaping imprecations upon the cardinal, whom they declared the enemy alike of the state, and of God and man.[1] The Parliament, not without opposition, and somewhat constrained by violence, declared a formal union with the princess, and its representatives were sent to obtain the coöperation of the Parliament of Paris. A resolution was there offered, asking the queen to liberate the princes, and to grant peace and relief from their miseries to the people of Guienne; the Frondeurs were still firm in their hostility to Condé, and it was lost by a vote of 113 to 65. But crowds gathered at some of the sessions, crying out against the government, and accusing even Beaufort of being a Mazarinite, and the cardinal complained that when he was openly attacked in the Parliament no voice was raised in his defence.[2]

Negotiations continued between the two cities, and the Parliament of Paris, though making no formal union, yet interposed its friendly offices in behalf of the Parliament of Bordeaux. One of the remonstrances presented by the latter was thought by all to have been prepared in Paris, on account of the elegance of the style and arrangement, which it was not believed could have proceeded out of Gascony.[3] Paris was then the literary centre, and the style, even of the best educated, and of members of the

[1] Lenet, 311, 313, 321.

[2] Talon, 390–391. Dis. Ven., cxi., 183. Let. de Mazarin, t. iii., for July

[3] Talon, 394.

highest courts, who lived remote from the capital, was ordinarily provincial and unpolished.

After Normandy and Burgundy had been quieted, the Court returned to Paris, but Mazarin resolved to march south, and endeavor to allay the disturbances there. Such an expedition was viewed with little favor by the leaders of the Fronde.[1] Notwithstanding their nominal alliance with the cardinal, they were willing that his power should be embarrassed by internal disturbances. Mazarin, however, decided that it was necessary, and in July he proceeded southward with a considerable army towards Bordeaux. The young king accompanied the expedition, but his presence did not command obedience. It was voted that neither the cardinal nor the troops of the king should be received into Bordeaux, and the city was thereupon reduced to a condition of partial siege. Negotiations were begun and it seemed probable that terms could be agreed upon, but an ill-advised act of severity strengthened the feeling of resistance. The Castle of Vayres was defended against the royal army by Richon of Bordeaux. When the castle surrendered, it was resolved to deal with its commander, not as a prisoner of war, but as a rebel. Notwithstanding threats of retaliation, he was condemned to be hung, as one taken in open insurrection, and the sentence was forthwith executed. This solitary example of severity, visited on an officer of secondary rank, apparently because he had made a gallant resistance, excited in Bordeaux rage rather than fear. The inhabitants deplored the cruel death of their fellow-citizen, and voted to meet this act by reprisal. The lot fell on a Captain Canol, who had been made prisoner by the insurgents. He was found talking with some ladies, and was instantly taken to execution. The man was a Huguenot, and some said that time should at least be allowed for a priest to visit him, and convert him from his errors before it was too late. But the mob cried out that he was a Mazarinite, and so he would be damned at any rate, and the unhappy man was

[1] Dis. Ven., cxi., 92, 93.

hanged forthwith, and his body left suspended from the walls of the town. A solemn mass was said for the repose of Richon's soul, and it was attended by the members of the Parliament, and of the city bodies, who declared they thus showed their respect for one who had been sacrificed for his country.[1]

The populace continued fierce in its zeal for the Prince of Condé. A general review was had and twenty-five thousand men were said to be under arms, all declaring they would die rather than consent to peace unless the princes were liberated. The streets resounded with innumerable cries of "Long live the king and the princes, no Mazarin!" The young Duke of Enghien, hearing the sound of the drums and musketry, cried to his attendant: "Give me my sword, that I may go and kill Mazarin."[2]

The Parliament of Paris continued its endeavors to obtain favorable terms of peace for a sister court. Already, Condé's imprisonment had lessened the popular hostility to him, and the Frondeurs were wearying of their alliance with Mazarin. Though Orleans opposed any measures for the release of the princes, he promised the people of Guienne that they should be relieved from Épernon.[3] Favorable consideration was asked for the complaints of the magistrates of Bordeaux, and both the Parliament and the duke sent their representatives to endeavor to make peace. Such interference with its dealings with a rebellious province was little relished by the government. Delegates from Bordeaux proceeded directly to Paris without paying any attention to the regular officers of the crown. The cardinal was obliged to order the Duke of Épernon to leave the province, though he protested this was to sacrifice the authority of the crown. He still struggled to have the suspension of the duke's authority only temporary. He had long protected Epernon, sacrificing in this

[1] Lenet, 331, 332, 7. Montglat, 234. Motteville, 353. Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 664. Mémoires de Coligny-Saligny, 32–34.

[2] Histoire Veritable, etc., 46.

[3] Aff. Etr. France, t. 871, p. 77. Talon 391.

instance the welfare of the state to the elevation of his nieces.[1] As is the case with many men, Mazarin's most unjustifiable acts were committed when he was seeking the advancement of his family.

The various delegations could not reach any terms that would be accepted both by the Bordalese and by the regent. Summer was passing away. The incursions of the Spanish threatened Paris and Northern France, and it was necessary for Mazarin to begin active operations against Bordeaux, or retreat with the disgrace of leaving the city unsubdued.[2]

On the 5th of September the royal forces, under the Marshal of La Meilleraie, began the siege of the town. It was continued for ten days with no great loss on either side, and with no marked advantage. The princess encouraged the defenders, although she declared that she would oppose no peace that was deemed for their interest

[1] The charge that Mazarin protected Épernon in the hope of marrying his niece to the duke's son was universally made. The Venetian ambassador refers to it in despatches of March 22, June 28, August 2, *et pas.*, 1650. He says in August, t. cxi., 170. "Non havendo havuto altra causa la protezione di Epernon che il matrimonio d'una nepote." The cardinal himself declared that such rumors were absurd, and that he cared nothing for such a marriage, (despatch to Le Tellier, July 29, 1650; Let. iii., 641), but other letters show how much this and other alliances occupied his mind. See his letters to Épernon in 1648 and 1650, Lettres t. iii., *passim*, in which he promises Épernon his support, refers constantly to their common interests, and shows his desire for Épernon's good-will. The great office of Admiral had been promised to Vendôme, as a part of the contract by which his son Mercœur was to marry one of the cardinal's nieces. Mazarin's letters show how entirely this important office was bestowed to secure the alliance. He writes Le Tellier: "I cannot disguise the fact that the Queen is greatly enraged at the proposition to give the admiralty at once to M. de Vendôme without any thing being said of the marriage, Her Majesty has said that she would be greatly pained to give occasion to the world to mock her and me if this office and the survival of it should be carried off without any talk as to the marriage." Despatch of May 1, 1650. Here, as always, Mazarin claimed that these advancements of his own family, though indifferent to him, were insisted on by the regent. He used his influence with her to have such demands made nominally in her name. Mazarin's defence of Épernon, and his resolution to protect him, appears in a great number of letters. Lettres, t. iii., 625, 679, 782, 806, etc. Lettres de Colbert, i., 26. Carnet de Tours, 63–5, etc.

[2] Lenet, 371.

by the citizens. Bouillon and Rochefoucauld were in the city and endeavored to keep its inhabitants zealous in their opposition to the government. But on the 15th, deputies from the Parliament of Paris arrived bringing terms of a proposed peace, which were gladly accepted by its defenders, who were wearied with their exertions, and by the burgesses, whose zeal was abated by the long-continued hostilities. The adherents of the prince feared that such a peace would leave him a captive, but they were in no condition to oppose the popular desire. There was no money to pay the troops, and but a scanty supply of provisions. Special causes also cooled the zeal of the people of Bordeaux. The grapes were now ripening on the hills, and the season of the vintage was drawing near. After the vintage, they told Lenet, they would embark again in the cause, but now the grapes must be gathered. To lose the chief crop of the year would mean a season of want and business depression. The owner of a rich grapery longed to be at liberty to gather his fruit unhindered by sieges or predatory troops; the shop-keeper feared lest the country people, losing the product of their vines, should have no money with which to buy his wares; the judges were wearied of their position as leaders of an insurrection against the royal authority. Retz claimed that their character was such that the oldest and wisest of them could gamble away his property in a night without hurting his reputation.[1] But however low their moral standard may have been, the name of rebels was distasteful to them. Though Mazarin complained of the interference of the Parliament in this matter as a dangerous precedent, he was ready to grant easy terms. Little impression had been produced on the city by the attack of La Meilleraie, and alike the presence of hostile armies, and the intrigues of the Frondeurs and of Condé's friends, demanded his presence at Paris. When both parties were thus inclined, the deputies of the Parliament found little trouble in proposing acceptable terms of peace. Lenet and the followers of the Princess of Condé

[1] Retz, ii., 231.

lacked both money and men, and felt they could hope for nothing better than reasonable terms for themselves, leaving the liberation of the prince to fortune and intrigue. On October first, articles of peace were signed between the regent and the insurgents. Lenet boasts that their resolution, even in desperate circumstances, enabled them to make peace with the king almost as one crown with another. By the treaty, a full amnesty was granted to the inhabitants of Bordeaux, and to all who had taken any part in these disturbances; the Princess of Condé, Bouillon, Rochefoucauld, and all her other followers were allowed to retire to their residences in the full enjoyment of all dignities or offices which they held, on condition only that they laid down their arms, and continued in the future in fidelity and obedience. Épernon it was understood was not to be recalled to the province. Its inhabitants desired some one appointed in his place as governor, but it was said the king had not the power to deprive him of his office, though he agreed that the duke should not exercise its duties.[1]

On the 3d of October, the princess sailed from Bordeaux, accompanied by many of her officers, and escorted by a crowd of twenty thousand persons of all ages, who wept at her departure and poured benedictions upon her and her son. On the next day she visited the regent, and expressed her regrets if she had done any thing that had displeased, and also prayed for the liberation of her husband. "Now that you acknowledge your fault, you are in the right way," replied the queen. "I will see when I can give you the satisfaction you ask."[2] On the 5th, the

[1] For the disturbances at Bordeaux see Lenet. 233–411. Let. de Maz. for July, August, and September, iii., 581–852. Histoire Veritable, etc. Le Courier Bordelois, 1650. Suite du Journal du Parlement, 93–172. Dis. Ven., cxi, cxii., *passim* during these months. Morosini says the peace was received "con sommo contento della Corte e delli habitanti"—cxii., 26. Mazarin says it was received with joy at Bordeaux, but the abandonment of Épernon was very distasteful to the cardinal, iii., 823, 833, etc.

[2] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 841–4, 863. "Je ne fais nul cas de tout cela," he says of the refusal of the judges to visit him. Dis. Ven., cxii., 38. Montpensier, 71.

regent and her son made their solemn entry into the city. One of the perfect days of Southern France favored the solemnity, and the roaring of cannon, the waving of flags and tapestries, and the acclamations of a multitude ready to applaud any ceremonial, greeted the entry of the young king with the same enthusiasm with which they had bidden farewell to the princess. The Parliament, however, refused to call upon Mazarin, and the minister was obliged to submit to this affront. Bouillon and Rochefoucauld visited him, and were affably received. He took them and Lenet to drive. As they started in the carriage, the cardinal said: "Who would have believed, ten days ago, that we four would be to-day riding in one carriage?" "Every thing comes to pass in France," replied the author of the maxims.[1]

These internal dissensions had weakened the French armies, and French subjects endeavored to stir into life the ordinary Spanish torpidity. After Mme. de Longueville escaped into Holland she joined Turenne at the little city of Stenai, on the Meuse. Turenne claimed that he was under obligations to bear arms against the government until Condé should be set at liberty. It is more probable that the charms and smiles of Mme. de Longueville lured him into rebellion. Though he was not a favored lover, the admiration she had excited when she visited his camp on her way to Münster still exerted an influence over this cold and loyal soldier, and it carried him into an alliance with the Spanish, his life-long adversaries, in behalf of Condé, his life-long rival.

At Stenai Mme. de Longueville played a part fully to her taste. La Moussaie was also there, and she stimulated his zeal as well as Turenne's by her flattery, and a rivalry for her favor excited both to increased activity.[2] There,

[1] Lenet, 412, 413: "Tout arrive en France." M. Bazin seems to think this the origin of the mot which has become a proverb, and which has been so constantly verified by the extraordinary variations and changes of French politics for two centuries. Rochefoucauld had seen enough of such in his own career to have suggested the remark, which bears traces both of his sententiousness and his cynicism.

[2] Letters of Mme. de Longueville, published in *Journal des Savants*, 1853.

as among the followers of the Prince of Condé, war and coquetry went hand in hand. Early in May Mme. de Longueville issued a manifesto justifying her conduct in taking up arms. A despised clergy, a persecuted nobility, and a ruined people, together with the crowning outrage, the arrest of her brothers and her husband, had driven her to this course. By it she hoped to deliver the princes from an unjust imprisonment, to restore peace to France, and to free it from the unbearable yoke of the tyranny of a foreigner.[1] Her zeal was so great that she was included with Turenne, Bouillon, and Rochefoucauld in the royal proclamation registered by the Parliament, in which they were declared disturbers of the public repose, guilty of high treason, deprived of all their dignities and offices, and their estates confiscated to the government.[2]

But as no one believed such punishment would be inflicted, to be thus singled out for condemnation gratified Mme. de Longueville's vanity without exciting her fear. She and Turenne made a treaty with the Archduke Leopold, by which it was agreed that no conditions should be made with France until the princes were relèased from prison, and a just, equitable, and reasonable peace had been made with Spain.[3]

The early campaign of the new allies was unsuccessful. They laid siege to Guise and were repulsed, to the great satisfaction of Mazarin.[4] But in August, when the march to Guienne of the forces of the king had left the northern frontiers ill guarded, these were invaded by the Spanish. After capturing some towns, they met the French, under Hocquincourt, at Fismes. In command of the invading forces were the Marshal of Turenne and the future Marshal of Luxembourg, the two greatest French captains of the age. They were to acquire permanent fame in the service of France, but they gained little military reputation when leading foreigners against their native land.

[1] This manifesto is found in "Choix de Mazarinades," ii., 168–176.

[2] Talon, 389. Molé, iv., 81–83. [3] Turenne, 425, 426.

[4] Montglat, 230. Turenne, 426. Instructions à Tellier, "Journal d'un Bourgeois," p. 8.

Hocquincourt, however, was repulsed and fell back with some loss, and late in August the enemy penetrated as far as Ferté Milon, only ten leagues from Paris. Hocquincourt's disaster, exaggerated by rumor, spread consternation there and in the country round, and it was expected within a day or two to see the Spanish colors flying before the walls of the city. But the position of the invaders was full of peril. The French forces were assembling, while the promised risings on behalf of the princes did not occur. Turenne was anxious they should push on and endeavor to liberate Condé and his associates, who were still at Vincennes, but the Archduke saw many dangers in such an attempt, and uncertain advantage even if it were successful. If the princes were liberated, all parties might become reconciled, and Spain be deprived of the benefit she derived from the dissensions of her adversaries. He distrusted, said one, the French humor, easily embroiled, but still more easily reconciled.[1]

But the cardinal resolved to remove so valuable prizes out of danger's way. He had already desired to change their place of confinement to some spot where they would be farther from Paris.[2] On the other hand, the Frondeurs, led by Retz, insisted that if they were transferred to any other place it should be to the Bastille. There they would be entirely under their control, and a way would be open at any time for a new turn in the political kaleidoscope, and for a reconciliation which would leave Mazarin exposed to the united assaults of the factions.[3] Before he changed the place of the prisoner's confinement, he wished, however, the consent of the Duke of Orleans, whose position, if not his talents, still gave him great influence. After La Rivière's overthrow, the duke had fallen under the control of a still more dangerous adversary, for he was now guided by the insidious counsels of the coadjutor of Paris. Retz claimed that he did not desire to have

[1] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 768, *et pas.* Montglat, 231. Turenne. 427. Lenet, 318. Plessis Praslin, 406–419. Motteville, 354. Mss. of Estrées, cited in Cheruel, iv., 143, 144.

[2] Let. de Mazarin, iii., 607.

[3] Dis. Ven., cxi., 16. Let. de Mazarin, iii., 769, 922.

thrown upon him the burden of Orleans' fears and irresolutions. He had thought to put the President Bellievre in the place, because, he said, it was necessary that Orleans should always have some one to govern him.[1] The duke objected that Bellievre's appearance was too keen and bourgeois, and Orleans at last drifted under the control of the coadjutor, to the great sorrow of the Court, who dreaded his restless ability, and to the discomfort of Retz himself, who feared that his favor would interfere with his libertine life. The importance of having the custody of Condé was appreciated by Retz, but the Court succeeded in obtaining from Orleans a consent that the princes should be temporarily taken to Marcoussis beyond the Seine, and removed from danger of capture until another place of confinement could be agreed on.[2]

Thus deprived of any chance of releasing the prisoners, Turenne was ready to fall back from Paris. The army lay for a month at Fismes in Champagne, and ambassadors were sent to ask the Duke of Orleans to agree on terms of peace between the two countries. The duke was pleased to assume such a rôle, and Mazarin deemed it politic to authorize these negotiations. Orleans sent envoys to treat with the archduke, but Leopold was only trifling, and the mediators were finally informed that the negotiations could best be carried on with Orleans in person, and not at present, but at some other convenient time. Instead of treating for peace, the archduke laid siege to Mouson. The town was not one of great importance, but it made a long and stubborn resistance. Rains and the lack of ammunition delayed the enemy, and the place did not surrender until November 6th, after seven weeks of siege. Wearied and reduced in numbers, the Spanish army then went into winter quarters.[3]

Apart from the terror and suffering they had inflicted on Northeastern France, the Spaniards made some prog-

[1] Retz, ii., 217.

[2] Aff. Etr. France, 871, p. 158.

[3] Montglat, 231–32. Dis. Ven., cxii., 15, 16, 19, 24. Let. de Mazarin, iii., 773, 783. Turenne, 427 and 428.

ress in other regions. In May, both Piombino and Porto Longone were invested. These places had been conquered but four years before, at an enormous expense of money, and a serious loss of men. Their capture had made Mazarin's brother a cardinal, and his enemies said that was the only object of so great exertions, but to lose them again seemed a disgraceful end to those costly endeavors to gain a foothold in Central Italy. The French government was, however, too crippled to be able to preserve what it had cost so much to gain. The small forces garrisoning the towns defended them with valor, but the resistance they offered caused only delay. On June 20th, Piombino surrendered. Porto Longone held out until the last of July, when its governor agreed to capitulate if he did not receive succor within fifteen days. No succor was sent, or attempted to be sent, and the conquests of Mazarin proved as evanescent as most French conquests in Italy. The loss of these places caused little regret. Their possession was so associated with Mazarin that many were quite content to see them recaptured by Spain.[1]

The government was hardly able to cope even with its internal enemies, and was almost powerless from want of money. Mazarin was then in Guienne trying to quiet the troubles that had commenced from the support he gave Epernon. "In God's name," he wrote, "let the superintendent raise money in some way to pay the troops. The soldiers are without money, without clothes, and without food." In Catalonia their distress threatened the loss of that province. The people there had rebelled against Spain on account of the oppression they suffered from Spanish soldiers, and for a like reason they would now rise and expel the French. "It is a crime," he wrote again, "not to raise money in any way, rather than lose places which, like Casal and Brisach, have been won by torrents of French blood." For himself he had not a sou nor any hope of finding one.[2]

---

[1] Dis. Ven., cxii., 16.

[2] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 586, 710, 733, 797, 846, etc.

After the peace of Bordeaux, Mazarin spent a few days in the endeavor to rekindle by the royal presence the flames of loyalty in that city, and then turned his face northward. He was much embarrassed as to the course he should pursue. Paris needed his attention and the presence of the king, but the cardinal dreaded to return to the city in which he was held in abhorrence. His nominal allies, the Frondeurs, were cold in his support, and they made little effort to conceal the hostility which they had always felt.[1] The return was delayed, also, by the queen's illness, which detained her at Amboise for several days. She was depressed by the condition of her health and the unsatisfactory position of public affairs, but with her usual courage and pertinacity she pressed on as soon as she was able, and on November 8th she arrived at Fontainebleau. There she found embarrassment from the intrigues of Retz and his followers. She had asked the Duke of Orleans to meet her, but, acting under the advice of his associates, he received this request of his sister-in-law with indifferent courtesy. After much delay, due partly to discontent and partly to fear, Orleans at last betook himself to Fontainebleau, and there, notwithstanding his remissness, he was favorably received. His consent was asked to a measure on which Mazarin had set his heart. The three princes were still confined at Marcoussis, and Mazarin greatly desired to have them removed to Havre. He was entirely sure of that city, which was now under the command of Madame d'Aiguillon. Its strength defied attack, and it was far removed from the Frondeurs and from the Parisian populace. Plans for this change had long been laid, and the cardinal was eager to obtain Orleans' consent and have the prisoners at once conveyed to their new place of confinement. Anne asked the duke what he thought of such a change. "Half yes, half no," he replied. A consent was easily obtained on a matter which he apparently viewed with indifference. But Or-

[1] These intrigues against Mazarin are described in his letters for November and December, 1650.

leans was the slave of fear, and he constantly turned from one policy to another, as those who met him practised upon his timidity. That night the mistake of such a consent was pointed out to him by a Frondeur, who terrified him into believing that the princes once at Havre, Mazarin could treat with them or release them, as he saw fit, and their power might be united to the ruin of any other authority in the state. The next morning the duke declared loudly at Fontainebleau that he would not consent to the change, and for two hours he harassed Le Tellier, the secretary of state, with his remonstrances against the plan. But Le Tellier told him that it had already been announced, and the king's honor was at stake on its execution, while its results could only further that union between Orleans and the regent in which consisted the welfare of the kingdom. At early morning the duke had aroused Fontainebleau by his protests; by noon he was calm, but he still manifested displeasure; by evening he had again visited the queen and was in full harmony. All that he demanded was that he should not be required to enter Paris in the same carriage with Mazarin.[1]

No time was lost in transferring the princes to their new prison. On the 15th they were taken from Marcoussis, and were conveyed to Havre under a guard of eight hundred horse and four hundred foot soldiers. Some movement for their release was expected, but the transfer was so promptly and vigilantly executed that none was even attempted. The Count of Harcourt, illustrious from his victories at Turin and at Casal, himself acted as commander of the guard, a task perhaps unworthy of his great reputation. A storm of obloquy and ridicule was heaped upon him by the wits and Frondeurs of Paris, for having been willing to exchange the laurels of Italy for the posi-

[1] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 607. Talon, 399, 400. Motteville, 357. Retz, ii., 296–300, claims that Orleans, under his advice, consented to the transfer with dignity and promptness. Mademoiselle de Montpensier, 74, 75, says he did not consent at all. The account of Talon is probably the most accurate.

tion of tipstaff for Mazarin.[1] Under Harcourt's charge, the princes were safely lodged in the citadel of Havre.

But the removal which had been so much desired and so carefully planned made the situation worse instead of better. Condé's friends were indignant at the prospect of a longer and severer captivity. At Havre, it was said, the prisoners were entirely under Mazarin's control; they were confined in an unwholesome place, dangerous to health, and where they might be dead for a year before one heard the news.[2] Such complaints were used to increase the popular sympathy with the princes which was created by their long confinement, by the heroism of the Princess of Condé, and by the natural fickleness of the populace. On the other hand, the Frondeurs regarded this act of Mazarin as hostile to their interests. The princes might as well be confined in one of the cardinal's own houses as at Havre. There he could hold them indefinitely, subject only to his own will; if other factions seemed to be threatening, he could secretly make terms, and he would find Condé ready to promise his alliance as the price of his liberty.[3]

On November 16th the regent and her minister made their entry into Paris. They found the city mutinous and discontented. But a few days before the cardinal had been solemnly hung in effigy, and his portraits, arrayed in a red gown, and covered with infamous doggerel, had been dragged through all the public places of Paris.[4] A serious rupture with the Fronde was also threateneed by the demands of the coadjutor.

---

[1] A song, said to be composed by Condé in the carriage during the journey, was sold and sung all over Paris.

Cet homme gros et court,
Si connu dans l'histoire,
Ce grand comte d'Harcourt
Tout couronné de gloire,
Qui secourut Casal et qui reprit Turin,
Est maintenant,
Est maintenant,
Recors de Jules Mazarin.

[2] Talon, 400.

[3] Brienne, 128. Retz, t. ii., *passim.*

[4] Motteville, 358. Let. de Mazarin, iii., 917. Mazarin refused to offer any reward for the discovery of those who had thus insulted him.

Retz's activity in public commotions had been due less to the desire for emoluments or personal dignity, than was the case with most of his noble associates. He loved the excitement of intrigue. He delighted in late and hidden meetings, in midnight secrets, in Machiavellian maxims, in sending agents to arouse the populace of the city, in delivering long political dissertations to his lady-loves and his associates. He loved to cruise about Paris at night, disguised as a cavalier, arrayed in a hat with long plumes, and with his bandy legs concealed by rich and magnificent garments.[1] He desired a large political influence, but he was indifferent whether he exercised it as a member of the queen's council, or as a leader of the Parisian populace. He had not been greedy for pensions or sinecures, but the time had at last come when he resolved to demand the only dignity which was sufficiently imposing to allure him.

The idea of Retz's becoming a cardinal had been frequently suggested, and the queen, according to his statement, had offered him the nomination as a condition of his alliance against Condé. His family, and his probable succession to his uncle as Archbishop of Paris, gave the coadjutor a reasonable expectation of some day being made a cardinal, even if he had shown no political activity and boasted no political influence. The dignity was a great one. It gave a precedence in rank which was gratifying to vanity, and it usually secured an immunity from personal assault which was valuable in politics. Many cardinals had been chief ministers in France. For twenty-five years two cardinals had exercised an authority which overshadowed the crown, and such power Retz hoped some political revolution would bring to him. His active hostility to Mazarin insured his favor with Innocent X., who hated the minister, and Retz's friends were assured that if he could obtain the nomination of the French crown, the hat would be willingly and promptly bestowed by the Pope. It had long been the object of his ambition,

[1] Mém. de Nemours. Guy Joly, *passim.*

and in the summer of 1650, Retz formally demanded his own nomination for the next cardinalate to be given to France. He announced that the time had come when he must be a cardinal or the leader of a party. The choice was offered the Court of securing him permanently by obtaining for him this dignity, or by refusing it, of driving him to exert his influence in Paris to disturb the government and overthrow the minister.

This request was doubly odious to Mazarin. He feared the influence and the ability of the coadjutor, and he knew well that no favors could hold him in alliance with the administration. If Retz were made a cardinal, there would remain nothing by which he could be allured. His desire then would be to become, not Mazarin's lieutenant, but his rival or his successor. There was, moreover, a strong antipathy between the two men, which they could not conceal, and much less repress, even when policy demanded. Mazarin's private notes and his letters to the queen are filled with complaints of Retz's unscrupulous character, his intrigues, his ambition, his faithlessness, his disturbances of public peace, his violations of private morality, his contempt for the religion which he professed and the sacred office which he filled.[1] "God never made a worse man than the coadjutor," wrote Mazarin's secretary.[2] A formal request for his nomination to the cardinalate was made to Le Tellier, and he was asked to send it to Mazarin. These agreeable despatches, as Retz styled them,[3] were received by the minister while in Guienne, and he attempted the hopeless task of trying to cajole an acute and experienced enemy. Mazarin wrote frankly to Le Tellier, late in August, that there was no argument that would bring him to grant the coadjutor what he

[1] Carnets, *passim*, Lettres à la reine, 1–13, etc. Instructions to Le Tellier in supplements to Retz's Mem., vols. ii. and iii. "The queen," he writes Le Tellier, "will never nominate the coadjutor for cardinal, because she knows that he is a very bad man, having neither religion nor fidelity, and that all the world knows him for such." Mazarin's letters for 1650 contain constant complaints of the conduct and intrigues of Retz.

[2] Instructions à Tellier, September 17.

[3] Retz, ii., 293.

demanded; increased power would only make him the more dangerous, and he would continue his hostility, having nothing to hope or fear from the government.[1] Temporizing measures were, however, chosen, and the cardinal, relying as usual on time, endeavored to have the matter postponed until his return. It was sought to satisfy the coadjutor in other ways. His debts should be paid, and he should receive some rich abbeys and preferments.[2]

Retz had his price, but it was not money and abbeys. To have his debts paid was a small temptation to a man who had lamented that at the same age Cæsar owed six times as much as he, and such offers were contemptuously rejected. Special endeavors were made to draw from her alliance with the coadjutor Madame de Chevreuse, of whose sagacity both the queen and Mazarin had a high esteem, but she remained constant to his cause. When the Court had returned to Fontainebleau, she went there to use in Retz's behalf that persuasive skill in which she had no superior, and to insist upon an answer to his request.[3] Mazarin held out hopes which, for the moment, deceived even Madame de Chevreuse. The matter was submitted to the council, and under cover of its opposition, a definite refusal was given to the request. The coadjutor's hostility to Mazarin was inflamed, both by the refusal, and by the fact that, from the demand which he had made, his opponents could diminish his influence by claiming that he was no longer disinterested in his conduct.

At the same time that Retz suffered this disappointment, an important office was given to a man who was destined to be prominent equally from his capacity and his corruption. Nicolas Fouquet had shown, in his position as a master of requests, ability and devotion to Mazarin, and he was now chosen for the important office

[1] Instructions à Tellier, August 28 and 29, 1650. Lettres de Colbert, i., 33–8. These were written by Colbert, but under Mazarin's dictation.

[2] *Ibid.*, September 17th, 18th, *et passim*.

[3] For these negotiations see Retz's account in his memoirs, ii., 281–308, corrected by Mazarin's private notes and instructions, and the letters of Le Tellier from August to December, *passim*.

of procureur general. The place was of great dignity and of great value. The holder of the office was entitled to receive from his successor the sum of 450,000 livres, and this great amount Fouquet paid to his predecessor on taking his place.[1]

These changes and intrigues did not draw Mazarin's attention from the external interests of France. Almost alone among the French leaders of the day, he never forgot the Spanish armies during Parisian discontents, and he never favored a Spaniard to coerce a Frenchman. A desire to strengthen his own position by a brilliant success over Spain may also have increased the cardinal's zeal, and he was always ready to take active part in a campaign. The enemy now held a large part of Champagne, and Mazarin was resolved to attack them. The king's army had entered the province under the command of the Marshal du Plessis, and early in December Mazarin went there in person. It is not certain whether the cardinal's early life as an officer had given him any military knowledge, but he had, at least, the activity and the courage of a good soldier.[2] Timid when surrounded by intrigues and faced by political discontents, he was bold in the presence of physical danger, and ready to take the chances of battle.

Rethel, a place of some importance, was invested on the 7th of December, and on the 14th it was surrendered by its Spanish garrison. Lieut. General Manicamp had taken a gallant part in pressing the siege, and in honor of their delivery from a foreign yoke, the inhabitants voted that they would give a sword to him and to the oldest heirs male of his house for all time to come.[3] Turenne led an army to the relief of the town, but finding it had surrendered, he fell back a little distance. Then the French came up and he resolved to give battle. The

[1] Le Tellier à Mazarin, October 12, 1650. Aff. Etr. France, 871, p. 99. Let. de Mazarin, iii., 825, 881.

[2] Retz says that Mazarin was filled with the idea of his military capacity, and frequently talked of it with him, distinguishing between the government and the conduct of the army.—ii., 329. Retz's statements as to Mazarin must be received with caution, as many of them are untrue. [3] Montglat, 239.

French had been for several days under arms, working and marching amid the rain and mud, and the night before they had spent in order of battle amidst a cruel hailstorm, but they now marched against the enemy with alacrity and gayety. The contest was for a while obstinate, but it resulted in a complete victory for the French. Turenne's genius and fortune deserted him when he fought against his countrymen, and he narrowly escaped capture. His army was entirely scattered, and among the prisoners were the future Marshal of Luxembourg, and that Jarzé whose unfortunate devotion to the queen had made him so conspicuous. Three thousand of the Spanish were made prisoners, and twelve hundred men were killed.[1] Mazarin had not been present on the field of action, though he was near by at Rethel, from which place the battle took its name. The army was commanded by the Marshal of Du Plessis, who here, as on many other battlefields, showed himself a skilful general and a gallant soldier. The marshal found victory and misfortune together, for his son fell on the field of battle. It was too late to besiege Stenai, but it was hoped that so brilliant a campaign would confound the enemies of the government and reflect especial lustre on the cardinal, who had taken in it so active a part. But his enemies had gone so far that this victory, instead of disheartening them, stimulated them to greater activity. At first, indeed, they were in consternation. Weeping and despairing partisans wearied Retz all the night with their lamentations, and the Duke of Orleans was dumb with terror.[2] But they soon rallied. Even the effect of the battle of Rethel was decried, and Mazarin was ridiculed for trying to appropriate the credit of a victory at which he was not present, gained over an army which he had never seen.[3] An alliance between the followers of Condé

[1] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 929–961. Montglat, 239, 240. Turenne, 428–431. Du Plessis, 416–421. The battle was fought on December 15th.

[2] Retz, ii., 336.

[3] Brienne, 127. Mazarin in fact made no endeavor to claim any merit for this campaign to which he was not entitled. He even wrote requesting that his name should not appear in the reports published in the *Gazette*.

and the old Fronde had long been planned, and had been the political combination which Mazarin had always sought to prevent. These factions united, and having the assistance of the Duke of Orleans, could compel the regent to abandon the minister whom she had so long kept in power. Many things now rendered such an alliance possible and desirable. The unnatural union between the Fronde and Mazarin had been weak when first made, and had steadily grown weaker. The cardinal did not receive the aid he expected. The Frondeurs did not receive the offices and favors they demanded. He was planning to make the government so strong that it could do without their support. They desired to keep it so weak that it must have their support. And now Retz, with his life-long hostility to Mazarin inflamed by the open refusal of a cardinal's hat, was ready to give up the pretence of supporting the government. The friends of the princes claimed that Mazarin's promises for their release were not fulfilled, and the removal to Havre made their deliverance seem more hopeless.

In this, as in many junctures of the period, the chief part in devising and forming new combinations was taken by women. The Princess Palatine was a second daughter of the Duke of Mantua. She, herself, early became known by her adventures. She was beloved by the volatile Duke of Guise, who was then Archbishop of Rheims. She insisted on the title of Madame de Guise, and when the archbishop fled from France, she dressed herself in man's clothes and pursued him. When he had entirely escaped from her, she returned to Paris, and resumed her name as the Princess Anne. After this, she had been married to Edward, Prince Palatine of the Rhine, one of the sons of the unfortunate Elector Frederick. But the French women who married foreign princes longed for their own country, and the intrigues and pleasures of foreign Courts seemed dull and unprofitable when compared with those of Paris. Her husband was jealous and poor, but she persuaded him that only by living in the great world could

one gain its benefits, and she returned to Paris and there took a leading part in the politics of the day. She was now thirty-five, in the fulness of her beauty and her intellect. Retz declared her fit to govern a kingdom, and said that Elizabeth of England was not better able to conduct a state. Her eulogy was pronounced by Bossuet, when, over thirty years later, she left the world in which she had been so active, and a very different and more accurate description of her morals was given by Bussy Rabutin, whose love for witty scandal caused his ruin.[1]

An active friend of the princess in her intrigues was Madame de Rhodes. Madame de Rhodes could claim an hereditary right to shine among the ladies addicted to gallantry and politics. She was the illegitimate daughter of the Cardinal Louis of Guise and of Charlotte des Essarts, once the mistress of Henry IV. She had married a gentleman belonging to the family of Phillippe Pot, who had gained prominence at the States-General of 1484. Retz had formed a close alliance with her, and the libels of the time charged that she was one of the many loves of the coadjutor, but as the future cardinal in his memoirs speaks with freedom of all his conquests and does not claim her, the charge may have been unjust.[2]

The Palatine endeavored to unite the different political interests by a system of marriages. Madame de Chevreuse and Retz were to be won by the marriage of Mademoiselle de Chevreuse to the Prince of Conti. Orleans and Condé would be bound together by an alliance

[1] "Carte Geographique de la Cour," vol. i., p. 348. It has been denied that this was written by Bussy, but its wit, its scurrility, and its indecency, are all characteristic of him. See for other accounts of the Princess Palatine, Retz, i., 261; Mém. de Mademoiselle de Montpensier, edition Cheruel, i., 283. Tallemant des Reaux, iv., 538.

[2] A pamphlet of 1652 on this question, published in Mém. de Retz, ii., 313, gives a fair idea of the scurrility of the publications of the time. The morals of those they attacked were, from their own statements to the world, quite as black as they were painted. Retz, ii., 189. The freedom, and often the indecency, of the language and letters of this time are very marked. Cardinals wrote to duchesses in language that now a scullion would not use to a harlot.

between the young Duke of Enghien and one of Monsieur's daughters. All parties thus united, and controlling the courts by their parliamentary influence, would compel the liberation of the princes and the overthrow of Mazarin. This plan was carried out almost as it was originally devised. The Frondeurs feared that Mazarin would make an alliance with the princes, and they were eager to anticipate him. Madame de Chevreuse was allured by the proposal to marry her daughter to the Prince of Conti. Retz's intimacy with the daughter was thought to have become only a tender regard, and he now desired for her a safe and brilliant establishment. Beaufort was easily persuaded to join the movement. The most difficult task was in resolving the doubts and fears of the Duke of Orleans. Early in December a movement was begun in the Parliament for the liberation of the princes. On the 2d of December a petition was presented from the young Princess of Condé, praying for the deliverance of her husband. On the same day that it was laid before the Parliament the dowager Princess of Condé died. She had been the beautiful Charlotte of Montmorenci, and her career was brilliant and romantic, but checkered by many misfortunes and attended, perhaps, by more of splendor than of happiness. She had once expressed her regret that Bentivoglio had failed to obtain the Pontificate, for then she could have added a pope to the long list of cardinals, princes, marshals, and nobles of all degrees, who had been subjugated by her beauty. As a girl she had been pursued by an enamoured king, who declared his adoration by following her disguised as a one-eyed huntsman.[1] Forty years later, when age was coming on, she found her life turned into bitterness and sorrow by the imprisonment of both her sons. She had never seen them since they parted on the morning of their arrest, and their imprisonment and overthrow had wounded her affection as a mother and her pride as a princess. As the end came she saw the vanity of the life she had led. "Tell that poor, miserable

[1] Lenet, 230. Motteville, 360.

woman at Stenay," said the dying princess to a friend, speaking of her daughter, Madame de Longueville, "the state in which you see me, and let her learn to die."[1] The daughter, many years before her own end, was to renounce her career of ambition and pleasure and make her life one long preparation for death.

While the mother of Condé was laid to rest from her pomps, her loves, and her disappointments, the Parliament considered the petition of her daughter-in-law for the liberty of her sons. Such a request furnished an opportunity to demand the liberation of the princes, but the judges were in doubt, and they avoided the question by resorting to technicalities. The rules of the body forbade a married woman's acting in the name of her husband, and, though here the husband was in close confinement, from which he could send neither petition nor authority, the procureur and advocate-general, "considering that the solemnities of judicial proceedings corresponded to the ceremonies of religion," recommended that the petition be dismissed.[2] But an agent now appeared before the courts presenting a letter, which he said had been signed by the princes, and by them given to an attendant on their journey to Havre. This letter was addressed to the court, and asked for justice and for release from their imprisonment in violation of the declaration of October, 1648.[3] These matters were under discussion on the ninth, when the queen sent for some of the members, and, being then ill in her bed, requested of them that the subject might rest until her recovery. Such a request could not be altogether denied, but the Parliament was not willing to wait long for courtesy. It was voted on December 10th that the matter should stand till the 14th. The regent complained that was allowing short time to a queen who had suffered paroxysms of fever and had been eight times bled.[4] Notwithstanding her com-

[1] Motteville, 360. [2] Talon, 403. [3] Lenet, 489.

[4] Talon, 403, Dis. Ven., cxii., 100, *et pas.* Journal du Parlement, 1650, 1–9.

plaints and the news of the victory at Rethel, the judges proceeded with their deliberations. The attacks on Mazarin became bolder, and, on December 30th, solemn remonstrances were voted, demanding the deliverance of the captive princes. It was said that the Parliament even contemplated the union of all the courts of France.[1]

Upon his return from Champagne, Mazarin found, instead of quiet insured by victory, disturbance fostered by the union of his enemies. He was informed of these projected alliances through his system of spies, but he seems to have been undecided and unready in meeting them. He had himself been pleased with the idea of marrying one of his nieces to the Prince of Conti, but he was unwilling to expose himself again to the insolent dictation of Condé.[2] He would not consent to gratify the ambition of a man as odious and dangerous as he thought Retz. He seemed irresolute, confused, and was charged with using a petty finesse.[3] Rochefoucauld took part in the negotiations for a reconciliation between Mazarin and the Condés, and he declares that the cardinal showed in them none of his usual ability.[4] He hoped to detach the vacillating Orleans from the alliance, and that Madame de Chevreuse would not assist with her genius for intrigue in any plans against himself, and he trusted that time and his own acuteness would divide the councils of his enemies.[5] But their plans were laid too discreetly to be thwarted simply by inaction. The cardinal endeavored to have Orleans and the regent agree on the terms upon which Condé should be released, but the duke was controlled by the faction of the coadjutor. A wiser plan was suggested

[1] Carnet, xv., 1. Mazarin charged all the intrigues to the faction of the coadjutor.—1–4.

[2] According to Rochefoucauld, 223, *et seq.*, he offered Mazarin, by the authority of Madame de Longueville, reconciliation with the entire family if he would release the princes. [3] Rochefoucauld, 226. [4] Rochefoucauld, 226.

[5] Mazarin's information and views are found in the xv. Carnet, which is filled with the events of this crisis, p. 1–31. His chief hope seems to have been in keeping Orleans friendly to the Regent. See also Aff. Etr. Fr., 872., 161, etc. Letters of Mazarin to Le Tellier, Nov. and Dec., 1650.

by Mazarin. Meetings should be held of the principal bourgeois and citizens of Paris, and there addresses should be made pointing out the evils which the city suffered from these frequent disturbances, and showing that if France could enjoy tranquillity an honorable peace would soon be obtained from Spain.[1]

On the 20th of January, 1651, the remonstrances of the Parliament were presented by Molé to the regent. Though the first president was friendly to the government and often did it good service by checking or delaying the ardor and the insubordination of the chambers, yet, when the Parliament had declared its resolution, he was always ready to give expression to it. His dignity of manner added weight to what he said, and he was fearless of utterance in any presence. Now, also, he was perhaps in full sympathy with the demands. He had never been friendly with Retz. Though Retz had a sincere admiration for the first president, whose character, except in personal intrepidity, was so unlike his own, Molé had only mistrust for the involved intrigues and the dangerous ambition of the coadjutor. But Molé had always been friendly with Condé, and the prince's long and illegal detention shocked the judicial mind. On this occasion, he expressed the views of the Parliament with a boldness and a freedom that delighted the Frondeurs and scandalized the regent. His majesty, said he, must know the sad condition to which France was reduced, and how many conquests, won by great expenditure of blood and treasure, had been unhappily lost. Such misfortunes following the arrest of the princes showed the unfortunate policy of that act, which had been the cause of all their evils. Since that unhappy day, there had been only division, civil war, and a decrease of the royal authority. All well wishers of the state desired the release of the captives, who were now held where their lives were in danger. Their illustrious services should blot out all light suspicions. The force of the kingdom was in the

[1] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 966, 971.

union of the royal family. With Orleans and Condé united, nothing could overthrow the fortunes of the state. Therefore the king was besought to release the princes, that they might continue to show their valor and expose their lives for the happiness and tranquillity of France.[1]

Mazarin listened with displeasure to this reference to his unfortunate policy, while the young Louis showed his impatience of any interference with the dignity or omnipotence of a king, and declared that if he had not feared giving offence to his mother, he would have silenced Molé and chased him from his presence.[2] On the 30th, the answer of the regent was given by Chateauneuf, the guard of the seals. It declared that the intention of their majesties was to pardon the princes and forget the past, but they must wait for a fit time, in order to oblige those who were in arms to lay them down, and those who were in alliance with the enemies of the state to return to their duty.

Meantime, the alliance projected by the Palatine had been completed. Formal articles embodying its terms were signed on January 30, 1651.[3] By these articles, which were contained in four separate treaties, it was agreed that the princes should be set at liberty, and Mazarin be driven from his place. Condé should not demand the office of Constable, nor make changes in the council without Orleans' consent. To bind these two together, the young Duke of Enghien was to be married to one of Orleans' daughters, when the parties should reach a proper age. It was agreed in behalf of the princes and of Madame de Longueville, that the Prince of Conti should seek Mademoiselle de Chevreuse in marriage, and Conti's faith and honor were pledged that so soon as he was at liberty he would wed her in the face

[1] A full account of this speech is contained in Talon, 405, 406. These transactions are reported as they occurred by Morosini—Dis. Ven., cxii., 149, *et seq.*

[2] Talon, 406.

[3] A treaty by which Retz and others bound themselves to labor for the prince's liberation had already been signed.

of our Holy Mother Church. The princes were to see that the Court paid the Duchess of Montbazon within two years 90,000 crowns, and she undertook, for that amount, to control Beaufort and his followers in their interests. The princes promised Orleans to honor with their friendship his adherents, and especially Beaufort and Retz. The signatures of Condé and Conti to the articles could not be obtained, but some of their friends acted in their name, and were authorized to negotiate for them. The greatest difficulty was in obtaining Orleans' coöperation. His timidity and irresolution were excited to the utmost at a crisis like this, and by plans and treaties of such importance. Even Retz's persuasive powers were insufficient, and the duke had to be enlisted almost by force. Caumartin, with the treaty in his pocket, caught him between two doors, put a pen in his hands, and the duke signed as if he was signing a contract with the fiend, and was afraid of being surprised by his good angel.[1] It was not strange that Orleans should dislike to put his name to such a paper, for in the July preceding, he had signed with the regent a solemn and very different treaty. By that, it had been agreed that under no circumstances should the princes be liberated during the regency, and as it was important they should not be at liberty until the king was old enough to manage the state, both agreed to use all efforts that the princes should be kept in confinement for at least four years after Louis reached his majority. They agreed, also, that neither should take or allow any steps for the princes' liberation without the knowledge and consent of the other.[2] But where factions represented only personal interests, and were espoused and abandoned as pique or personal ambition suggested, it was natural that political changes should be rapid. Mazarin charged Retz with having changed his party six

[1] Retz, ii., 326. These treaties are found at the Bibliothèque Nationale, and are printed in full in "Madame de Longueville pendant la Fronde," 378–382.

[2] This treaty is published in a note to Retz, vol. ii., 326, 327. Carnets, xiv., 66, 67.

times in less than eighteen months,[1] yet the coadjutor was as the pole star when compared with most of his associates.

The queen's response to the demand for the liberation of the princes left the hour of their deliverance postponed to an uncertain future, and it was, therefore, received with disfavor. When it came up for discussion on February first, Retz stated before the Parliament, that the Duke of Orleans had decided to coöperate and that he would do all in his power to obtain the release of his cousins. Such a public declaration from the uncle of the king, and lieutenant general of the kingdom, excited confidence and enthusiasm among the Frondeurs of every stripe. The coadjutor, after vainly asking Orleans to declare himself before the Parliament, had with difficulty obtained permission to speak in his behalf. Had the declaration been ill received, Orleans could easily have disavowed it, and on the night after he gave Retz this uncertain authority, his wife declared that the duke's labors over the matter were attended with greater pains than she had ever suffered in childbirth.[2] But the applause that followed the step gave him new confidence. He avowed the declaration to the judges and to Le Tellier, and on the fourth he attended the Parliament, and spoke in person. He declared that he was wearied of the fair words of the cardinal, and of his failure to perform them. He had long indulged the queen on this subject, but now the state was perishing from Mazarin's bad administration, and Orleans could not allow the interests of any one man to destroy the tranquillity of the kingdom. The incapacity, the inordinate ambition, and the sordid avarice of the Cardinal Mazarin were the cause of all their troubles, and he felt in conscience bound to chase away their author.[3]

[1] Lettres à la Reine, 10–13. [2] Retz, iii., 5–11.

[3] Talon, 409. Mazarin's Carnets during January are full of the endeavors made by the regent to find what Orleans' really desired. "La Reyne demande à S. A. R. s'il veut en effet la liberté de M. les Princes sans declarer son intention."—19, *et passim*. As Orleans' desires changed from week to week there was difficulty in ascertaining them.

Orleans was a ready and skilful speaker, and both his address and his rank added weight to his words. Great applause, especially from the younger members of the Inquests, greeted the duke's speech. All milder resolutions were voted down, and the king and queen were asked forthwith to liberate the princes and to dismiss the Cardinal Mazarin. The Parliament adjourned till Monday, the sixth, to deliberate on the answer which might be given to its petition.[1] When Mazarin was endeavoring to keep the Duke of Orleans from uniting with the Frondeurs, he had compared the Parliament to the English House of Commons, and its leaders to Fairfax and Cromwell. This comparison, which was alike inaccurate and injudicious, Retz reported to the body, where it was received with violent anger and protestations. One of the scenes followed common in French legislative bodies. Some cried that the cardinal should be instantly brought before them. Some, that he should be forthwith dismissed, and that the edict against foreigners should be enforced. All was rage and tumult. Mazarin had often accused Retz of wishing to play the part of a Cromwell, and of professing an admiration for Cromwell's character, but neither Retz nor his associates need have been at any pains to disown the resemblance.[2] They were but a genteel travesty on the great English leaders of the Long Parliament, and the Fronde itself was a burlesque on the English Revolution. As an immediate answer had been required, the representatives of the Parliament presented its request to the regent on Sunday. The Duke of Orleans, they said, had declared that he held in such aversion the person she had established as prime-minister, that he could take no part in the councils of the king. To obviate this obstacle, and in order that the lieutenant-general of the kingdom might again assist in its government, she was besought to remove the minister. Historical illustrations were given,

[1] Talon, 407–409. Retz, iii., 13, 14.

[2] Lettres à la Reine, vi. "On a bu à la santé de Cromwell," he says of one of their meetings. Carnet de Tours, 43.

from Justinian dismissing John of Cappadocia down to Henry the III. dismissing Épernon, which showed the wisdom of such conduct. Following these examples by dismissing the Cardinal Mazarin, she could grant relief to the complaints of all orders in the kingdom.[1] Anne told them to come the next day and receive her answer, but, on that day, the cardinal himself solved the problem, by abandoning to his enemies the place which he had for eight years held.

After Orleans declared his union with the opponents of the minister, every endeavor was made to draw him again to his allegiance to the regent. Anne reproached him, after the announcement of February first, and an angry interview followed. The duke left much irritated by his conference with the minister and the regent, and declared that he would never again put himself in the hands of that madman and that fury.[2] Anne endeavored to have Orleans visit her again, to see if a reconciliation could not be made. Knowing how easily he could be persuaded to any course, and that when he was exposed to personal solicitation from the regent, there could be no certainty of his resistance, Retz and his associates endeavored, and with success, to prevent any interview. Orleans sent word that he would never again enter the Palais Royal while Mazarin was there; besides, he had the gout and he could not go. Anne then offered to visit him at the Luxembourg, but this offer was evaded. Orleans told the king's governor that he would be held responsible for the king's person, and he ordered the city officials to keep guards about the Palais Royal, lest Louis should be taken from Paris. In this extremity, Mazarin sent the Marshal of Gramont to see if some reconciliation could not be effected with the princes, but it was now too late for such negotiations.[3] Unable or afraid to meet the storm which was aroused, Mazarin resolved to retreat before it. He

[1] Talon, 409–411. Dis. Ven., cxii., 164, 165. The proceedings of the Parliament are contained in Journal for 1651, i., 9–35.

[2] Retz, iii., p. 6., Retz puts this interview on January 31st.

[3] Aff. Etr. Fr., 874, pièce 16. 22.

was apparently no more threatened with danger than he had been before. His hold upon the queen's confidence and affection was unshaken, and she had the boldness and the stubbornness to support him to the last. But the minister lost his courage when the Parliament, the king's uncle, the followers of Condé, the old and the new Frondeurs had all united in demanding his overthrow, and when the inhabitants of the great city, in which he was, viewed him with hatred and scorn. Perhaps, also, he believed that his temporary retirement would strengthen the regent, and improve the condition of the kingdom. Though his policy was often selfish, it was more patriotic than that of his opponents, for theirs was a uniform selfishness, free from suspicion of regard for the public weal. Mazarin loved power and he sought it by tortuous ways, but he was usually mindful of the interests of the kingdom which he so greatly desired to rule, and of the interests of the regent, who gave him so unwavering a support. If he were away, the demand for his overthrow could no longer unite all parties, and he trusted to his own intrigues and to the jealousies of discordant elements to dissolve the alliance against him which now appeared so firmly united. His exile might be very brief. He might make a speedy alliance with Condé, and return under the shadow of his authority.[1] At all events, he decided to retire temporarily from the Court and from his office. The queen consented to this step, as to all plans on which the minister decided, although one of her attendants tells us it did not meet with her approval. In such a crisis as this, she was bolder than her minister and more reluctant to yield.[2] On the evening of February 6th, they had their final interview. Whatever her feelings were at seeing the man to whom she entrusted her son's kingdom and her own affections driven from her by his enemies, she preserved the calmness of manner which deserted her only when she

[1] The last entry in the Carnets is "Conditions avec M. le Prince," and contains an unfinished memorandum of terms that might be made with him on his release. Mazarin's diary, or Carnets, were abandoned on his retreat, and he never began them again.

[2] Motteville, 374.

was angry. After this interview, Mazarin disguised himself in a red cassock and a plumed hat, and followed by two gentlemen left the Palais Royal on foot. He went out of the city by the gate of Richelieu. There he met attendants and horses and went to St. Germain, where he passed the remainder of the night. The rumor of his intended flight had already spread through the city, and he feared being stopped, but the guardian of the gate of Richelieu had been bribed, and he passed through unmolested.[1]

At St. Germain, he waited to see what further steps were taken by the regent. Before he left Paris he had instructed her on the course which she was to pursue. If, even after his departure, Orleans and the Parliament should continue in their evil courses, instead of accepting this sacrifice as sufficient, Anne with the young king must leave Paris secretly on the night of the 7th. Away from Paris they would have troops, fortified places, the princes in their power, and would be masters of all, but remaining in Paris without being its masters, they ran a manifest risk. Should, however, it be impossible to escape, Anne was, under no circumstances, to consent to the unconditional release of the princes. But, if this also became necessary, Mazarin resolved that the release should be granted by him, and to guard against any measures to which she might be forced, he obtained from the queen a written order to the guardian of the prisoners, directing him to execute all orders of the Cardinal Mazarin concerning the liberty of the princes of Condé and Conti and the Duke of Longueville, notwithstanding any subsequent order that might be sent in her name or that of the king. Lastly, the young king was to send Mazarin a written promise that he would not abandon him.[2]

On the morning of the 7th, Orleans was asked to attend

---

[1] Motteville, 375. Loret, 91. Letter of Morosini, February 7, 1651. Dis. Ven., cxii., 164–168. Retz, iii., 27.

[2] Carnets, xv., pp. 29, 30. Letter of Mazarin of February 8th. Aff. Etr. t. 268 ; t. 267, 311. Mss. Bibl. Nat., 4209., 190–93. Motteville, 387.

the king's council, the offending minister having departed, but the Parliament was not satisfied with this victory. It voted thanks to the queen for the dismissal of the cardinal, but it coupled with them another demand for the release of the princes, and for a declaration that all foreigners should be forever excluded from the councils of the king. Orleans sent word that he could not go to the Palais Royal till the princes were at liberty, and the cardinal farther removed from the Court; he was now only at St. Germain, and from there he still governed the kingdom, while his nephews and nieces remained at the palace.[1] On the 9th, a resolution was adopted by the Parliament that within fifteen days Mazarin must leave the kingdom, taking with him all his family, and under no pretext and on no occasion should he be allowed to re-enter France.[2]

Mazarin's temporary retreat had led to no reconciliation, and had only encouraged his enemies. The regent now desired to escape from Paris with her son. She seems to have contemplated leaving on the night of the 9th, but the plan is said to have been revealed to Madame de Chevreuse by Chateauneuf and Villeroy. Whether the alarm was well founded or not, Madame de Chevreuse notified Orleans, and Retz was aroused from his sleep to go to the Luxembourg in all haste, and deliberate on the measures to be taken. The duke was found in bed, and he declared that the queen would not take such a step, and that no action was needed. But his wife scribbled an authority for the coadjutor to call out the city's forces in order to prevent the creatures of Mazarin taking the king out of Paris. The alarm was sounded, and the streets were soon full of martial shop-keepers and mechanics, rushing from their beds to join their companies. One colonel was not found at home, but his wife donned her petticoats, and going into the streets had the drum beat the alarm. De Souches was sent to the Palais Royal to see if the escape had been made. He insisted on entering the king's chamber, and found the young Louis in bed

[1] Retz, iii., 30, 31. Talon, 412. Dis. Ven., cxii., 167. [2] Talon, 413.

and the queen in tears, protesting that she had never harbored any such design.[1] However this may have been, it was impossible to execute it now, and the king remained in Paris almost as a prisoner. Soldiers guarded the gates, searching even baggage-wagons to see if he was concealed in them, and marched every night about the Palais Royal. Bargemen patrolled the Seine with their boats lest the king and queen should escape by water. "The prince is at liberty," said Molé afterwards, "but the king, our master, is a prisoner." "At least he is not a prisoner in the hands of Mazarin," was the reply.[2] Anne could resist no longer, and, on the 10th, she signed an order for the unconditional release of the princes. Her condition was very miserable. She was separated from the man she loved, and was hardly less a prisoner in Paris than Marie Antoinette one hundred and forty years later. "I wish it was always night," she said to her attendant, "for though I cannot sleep, the silence and solitude please me, because in the day I see only those who betray me."[3]

---

[1] Motteville, 378, 379. Retz, iii., 34–37. Montglat, 246, 247.

[2] Dis. Ven., cxii., 171–76. Retz, 39. Montglat, 247. Motteville, 380, 381. Joly, 46.

[3] Motteville, 376.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE EXILE OF MAZARIN.

MAZARIN saw that there was no hope of making terms with Orleans, and he therefore left St. Germain and travelled towards Havre. On the road he was informed that the queen had ordered the release of the princes, and he decided that the only course left for him was to grant the release himself. Such a step might lead to a reconcilation with Condé or establish some hold upon his gratitude. He reached Havre on the 13th of February, before the arrival from Paris of the messengers bearing the queen's order of the 10th. He was received with the firing of artillery, and was taken to the chamber of the princes. He announced to them their unconditional release, and asked in return their friendship for the king, for the regent, and for himself. The cardinal tried to assure Condé that his imprisonment was due to Orleans, while the liberation had been granted at his own solicitations. They dined together, but the situation was a forced one, and Mazarin seemed embarrassed. After dinner Condé, Conti, and Longueville prepared to leave. Mazarin followed them to the carriage, and, though the forms of courtesy were preserved, as they rode off Condé is said to have burst into an uproarious fit of laughter, within the hearing of the fallen minister.[1] Mazarin might better have saved his dignity than made this humiliating and hopeless endeavor to obtain the good-will of the prince. Gratitude was unknown to Condé, and he felt

[1] Lettres de Mazarin, Feb. 13, 1651. Mss. Bibliothèque Nationale, 4209, 197. Montpensier, 79. Priolo, 301–305.

under no obligations for a release which had been granted when it could be no longer refused. Retz said that this step of the cardinal seemed to him, under all the circumstances, one of the most ridiculous of the time, but Mazarin hoped for good results from it.[1]

Condé was to show equal indifference towards those who had in truth gained his liberation, and who had far better reason to expect his gratitude. On the 16th of February, 1651, the princes arrived at Paris. The journey from Havre of one hundred and forty miles occupied three days. They were received with much enthusiasm. The same people who thirteen months before had burnt fires from joy at Condé's capture, now had them blazing in honor of his release.[2] They were met by Monsieur, who had then agreed to their imprisonment, and by whom they were now solemnly presented to the Parliament. They supped with him and with many of the political leaders, and the health of the king was drunk with the refrain, "No Mazarin!"[3] But hardly had the broken glasses been swept away, and the cheers ceased to re-echo, when Condé and his new allies began to find cause for variance.

A year's confinement had not taught the prince moderation or unselfishness. His father had been imprisoned for three years in the early part of the reign of Louis XIII., and the remembrance of it had exercised a restraining inuence over the rest of his life. Even his greed never overcame his prudence. But the son was of a more unruly nature. He was fierce in his desires, impatient of any sense of obligation, and unable or unwilling to conciliate enemies or soothe the vanity of friends. He was restored to liberty under circumstances which promised him absolute power. Mazarin was in exile, the young king practically a captive, the regent discouraged and apparently powerless.

His sister's reputation added to the lustre of the family

[1] Letter of Mazarin cited above. Retz, iii., 40. [2] Retz, iii., 42.
[3] Rochefoucauld, 447. Dis. Ven., cxii., 178, 180. Montglat, 246, 247.

name, and to its overshadowing influence in the state. After the release of her brothers and husband, Madame de Longueville had returned to Paris. She had stayed very contentedly at Stenai, planning campaigns with the generals in the morning and hearing them make love to her in the afternoon.[1] But she had taken part in the intrigues which led to the liberation of the princes, and had consented to the alliances by which this was secured. She reached Paris early in March, where, the *Gazette* says, every one applauded her heroic actions.[2] She had achieved the position for which her soul thirsted. To the sighs of lovers were now added the plaudits of statesmen. She was an acknowledged leader in French and European politics. She had made treaties, organized armies, liberated princes, exiled cardinals. She was not able to bear the intoxication of the position, and from the hour of her return in triumph her political career is a record of errors. Condé himself could hardly excel her in haughtiness. She received with a disdainful smile, not only the people of Paris, but the greatest seigneurs who came to do her reverence.[3] Over both her brothers she exerted a strong influence, and there is little doubt that, under the control of very feminine passions, she advised them to steps which were fatal to their political position. Madame de Longueville was brave, adventurous, and enthusiastic, but she had none of the good judgment, the sagacity, the consummate tact which made Madame de Chevreuse one of the great politicians of the age.

Meanwhile the fallen minister was slowly making his way into exile. When he parted from the princes at Havre, Mazarin hoped that upon their return to power their influence would be used to favor his recall. Some words uttered over their champagne at their last dinner in captivity, he interpreted as promises of their good offices.[4] Had such promises been given, Mazarin might have known how unlikely it was that they should be fulfilled. In break-

[1] Lenet, 353. [2] *Gazette*, 1651, 296. [3] Motteville, 388.
[4] Aff. Etr., t. 267, fo. 264. Mss. Bib. Nat., 4209., 196, *et seq.*

ing pledges he found the nobility equal to the clergy, and his hopes that Condé would ask the restoration of the man whom he had always hated, and by whom he had been kept thirteen months in prison, were soon dispelled. The minister went to Dieppe and thence into Picardy. At Paris the people were impatient at his delays, and complained of each day that the red shoes of the cardinal trod on French soil. The remonstrances of the Parliament were so angry, that the regent sent messengers to Mazarin at Doulens directing him forthwith to leave the kingdom in obedience to the edict. Secret messages of love and fidelity may have accompanied the public dismissal, to which the regent was forced. Mazarin replied in a dignified letter, which was read before the council. He should obey her majesty's commands, said the letter, as her commands had always been the rule of his life. Though unprovided with all things needed for a journey, he would forthwith go wherever he could find shelter. Rather than do any thing that was prejudicial to the state, he would yield to the passion of his enemies, but their own conduct showed they knew how certain was his fidelity to the king. Familiar as he was with the secrets of the state, they had not feared to expel him with violence, knowing that he would never turn his knowledge to the assistance of the enemies of France. He would gladly conceal from the latter the return he had received for his labors, lest they should wonder that a cardinal, after twenty-two years of faithful service, could find no safe retreat in any nook or corner of a kingdom, the boundaries of which had been so greatly extended by his pains.[1]

The governors of some of the frontier towns offered to sustain the cardinal with their forces, and to defy the edicts of the judges at Paris.[2] But Mazarin was not the man for such a course. Rather than face the storm he would bend to it, and wait till it had abated. More patriotic motives had also some influence, and deterred him

[1] Motteville, 383, 384. This letter of Mazarin's is printed in Mme. de Motteville's memoirs.

[2] La Barde, 605. Aff. Etr., 267., 439.

from stirring up civil war, In March he left France and sought refuge in the bishopric of Liège. It was not easy for him to find a suitable place for retreat.[1] In honorable contrast with Condé and the leaders of the Fronde, Mazarin would make no alliance with the Spanish. The king's uncle, the judges of the royal courts, the heads of the great families, which enjoyed honors and estates granted by the Capets and the Valois, joined hands with the enemies of their fatherland, in order to gain assistance in their revolts against their own government; but this Italian priest, in his hour of exile and distress, would seek no aid from those in arms against his adopted country. However selfish Mazarin may have been in his personal ambitions, Richelieu was no more steadfast than his successor in an unswerving endeavor to make France triumphant over all her foes. He wrote from Péronne to the Marshal of Gramont: "I do not tell you where I am going, for I do not know. Wishing to live and die a Frenchman, it would not be well for me with the Spanish or their allies. As for the friends of France they are almost all heretics. I do not think of Rome. I do not hate the Pope, but the Pope hates me."[2] He had with him his nieces, who, he wrote, were a greater embarrassment than could be imagined.[3] In April he went to Brühl, in the dominions of the Elector of Cologne, and there he remained until October. He was received with honor and treated with deference. Brühl was a pleasure house of the elector, but a short distance from Cologne. He found the palace furnished and adorned as was appropriate for a great minister, and gifts of choice wines and savory fish cheered his hours of exile.[4] But though the cardinal had at last been driven from France, he maintained a constant correspondence with Anne, and those of her ministers whom he trusted. His enemies were quite right in their claims, that whether he was writing from Brühl, or conversing

[1] Mss. Bib. Nat., 4209., 207, *et seq.*, Mazarin à Tellier.

[2] Letter of Mazarin of March 10, 1651, Aff. Etr., 268.

[3] Letters of March 10th, published in Motteville, 385, 386.

[4] Letter of April 1st, Aff. Etr., 267.

with her in the chambers of the Palais Royal, the counsels of the cardinal controlled the conduct of the regent.

Mazarin's hope had been that discord would soon arise between the jealous and inharmonious allies who were arrayed against him, and upon this he based his plans for a return to power. He was unable to cope with them when united, but he had for years withstood their hostility by dividing their forces. Anne obeyed his directions implicitly, and the burden of his instructions was to sow discord among the leaders of the Fronde.[1]

Hardly had he left Havre when questions arose which excited division between the nobility and the Parliament. Seven or eight hundred gentlemen had assembled in Paris at the hall of the Cordeliers. They had met to assist in the agitation which was to release the princes and exile the cardinal, but when those objects were accomplished they continued to confer on the condition of the country. To heal the evils from which their own order and all France were suffering, they demanded that the States-General should be summoned. Their convocation was also asked by an assembly of the clergy in behalf of their order. It was now nearly forty years since the States-General had met. In the troublous times that had intervened, a meeting of the States had been several times demanded and several times promised. The demands had been made with no desire that they should be answered, and the promises had been given with no intention that they should be fulfilled. The States had been convoked for March, 1649, but the call was little heeded, and the session was indefinitely postponed. Condé and Orleans seconded the demand that was now made. Over such an assembly, convened when the government was powerless, they hoped to exercise control. Alarming rumors were brought to the regent of the violent changes which they expected to accomplish by this means. On

[1] Such advice is found in Mazarin's letters at this period, together with constant suggestions as to the manner of alienating the factions. Anne followed implicitly the directions she received.

September 7th, Louis XIV. would have completed his thirteenth year, and the regency would cease at his majority. In a people so strongly attached to a monarchy as the French, it was easier to repress the unruly when the government was in the hands of a king, even if he were only a boy. Regencies had often been times of disorder. Those who reverenced a king felt that they owed to a regent neither obedience nor respect. Yet, with a boy of fourteen on the throne, it was impossible that his mother should not for some years keep an authority, which would be the greater, because she would exercise it in his name. To guard against this, to prolong the period in which their own authority could be unbridled and their disorders unchecked, it was said that the great nobles desired the States-General to meet while Louis was still a minor, and to change to eighteen the age at which a king could assume his authority. The regency would thus be extended for four or five years, and, together with this, it was hinted that the assembly would proceed to another step, depose Anne, and put the Duke of Orleans in her place.[1] The first article of the requests of the three estates would be to demand that Mazarin should never be allowed to return to France. Whatever measures were seriously contemplated, the regent looked with apprehension at any meeting of the States-General, and she found assistance in her opposition from the active hostility of the Parliament.

The Parliament of Paris desired to obtain political power for itself, and was jealous of any meeting of the National Assembly, in the presence of which its own political rôle was overshadowed. It even claimed at times a rank superior to that of the States-General. The States-General, said President Mesmes, in 1649, could only proceed by petition, and address their sovereign on their knees; but the Parliaments held a rank above them, being mediators between the people and the king.[2]

[1] Aff. Etr., 267., 396–7. Mss. Bib. Nat., cited *supra*, 310, 325, 328, 355, *et passim*. Letters of Tellier to Mazarin, Talon, 423.

[2] Journal d' Ormesson, i., 698.

The great body of nobles now gathered at the Cordeliers had convened by no summons, but both from the number and the rank of its members it was justly considered as a representative assembly of the nobility of the kingdom.[1] Irritated alike by their meeting and by the purposes for which they had met, the judges of the Parliament deliberated on declaring this assemblage an illegal body and ordering its dissolution.[2] Their jealousy of another power in the state was reciprocated by the nobility. A few great nobles were entitled to a seat in the Parliament of Paris. A few ambitious princes and prelates fostered the power of that body as an assistance to their own plans. But to the mass of the nobles and of the clergy—to the honest gentleman of ancient lineage, who lived at his château in the country; to the bishop who attended to the spiritual wants of his flocks, instead of intriguing for a cardinal's hat—this new and enormous power assumed by a body of lawyers was alarming and odious. "France," said the Bishop of Comminges, "is a body composed of three members—the clergy, the nobility, and the third estate. A fourth member cannot be joined without there resulting a horrible monster." It was shameful, cried the nobles, that from the overthrow of ancient laws, young scholars, just out of college, should become the arbiters of the public fortune, by virtue of a piece of parchment which cost them sixty thousand crowns.

Anne acceded to the demand for a convocation of the States-General, but she fixed the first of the following October as the time for their meeting. In behalf of the nobles and clergy, Orleans asked that the session should begin before the majority of the king. The pertinacity with which this was pressed excited the more Anne's apprehensions of the measures that might be attempted if

[1] It was said that in the decorum of their meetings they set a praiseworthy example to the assemblies of the judges. Affairs were discussed with much less noise and tumult than in the Parliament, and the speaker was free from annoying and discourteous interruptions.—Joly, 48.

[2] Journal du Parlement, 55–70. Talon, 423.

the States-General met while Louis still remained a minor. She refused to accede. Orleans tried to excite her alarm at the possible results of the irritation of the nobility and the bad feeling between them and the Parliament. Should that body pass a decree against the nobles, the latter would not suffer it. Barricades would rise in the streets of Paris, and blood would run in the gutters. First President Molé and his son Champlâtreux would be the first to be thrown into the Seine, and even the Palais Royal might not be left unmolested.[1] But Anne still refused to yield. Some endeavors were made to excite the magistrates of the Hotel de Ville and the bourgeoisie to join with the other orders in this movement, but they were weary of agitation, and their sympathies were more with the judges who had sprung from their midst, than with the nobles by whom they were regarded as Pariahs. Condé also was becoming lukewarm in this measure. He was allured by the great promises which the regent was now making him, and as his alliance with her grew closer, his ties to Orleans and his faction became looser. Nor was an assembly which might possibly make the Duke of Orleans regent a thing earnestly wished by the Prince of Condé. Anne refused to consent that the States-General should meet even one day before the king's majority, but she agreed that it should be convened for the day following, which was the 8th of September, and with this promise Orleans advised the nobles to be content.[2]

To this, therefore, the assembly assented, and it thereupon dissolved. Letters were sent into some bailiwicks directing deputies to be chosen for the forthcoming States-General, but before September the most of those who had clamored for the session had forgotten their demand, and those who had agreed to it found no trouble in disregarding their promise. One hundred and thirty-eight years were to pass before the three estates con-

[1] Mss. Bib. Nat. 4210., 329, Tellier to Mazarin.

[2] *Ibid.*, 332, letter of April 7th. Talon, 423–425.

vened.[1] Had they met during the disturbed period of the Fronde, it is difficult to say to what action such a body might have drifted. But the sentiments of the majority of the people and the differences between the orders were such that it is probable it would have accomplished little more than the States of 1614. A revolution like that of England was not possible in France at this period.

In the numerous edicts which the Parliament passed to hurry Mazarin out of France, it succeeded in embroiling itself also with the clergy, and materially dampening the zeal of the coadjutor. An edict had been introduced in February declaring that no strangers, even though naturalized, should thereafter sit in the council of the king. To this was added a provision that no one should be allowed to sit there who had taken an oath to any other prince than the king of France. The object of this was to exclude French cardinals from acting as ministers of the government, because they took an oath to the Pope. The first person who would probably be affected by the measure was Retz, who hoped soon to be made both cardinal and minister. "There is a fine echo," said the Prince of Condé, who bore no good-will to the ambitions of Retz, when this proposition was received with noisy acclamations.[2] To prevent Mazarin from returning to power, and Retz from obtaining power, was a measure of which both features were pleasing.

But the clergy received this proposition as one aimed at the dignity and influence of their order. Why, it was asked, should those who had received the highest dignity of the Church alone of all Frenchmen be deemed unfit to serve their country? If the plea was urged that they received their office from the Pope, the answer was plain. The Pope bestowed it upon those nominated by the king,

[1] The proceedings of the Assembly of Nobles are contained in Journal de l'Assemblée de la Noblesse, 1651. Mazarin advised the regent to talk about summoning the States-General, but "à les convoquer en effet, c'est ce que je ne me saurais pas résoudre de conseiller."—Aff. Etr., 267, fo. 264. Mss. Bib. Nat., 4209., 196, *et seq.*

[2] Retz, iii., 43.

and it was to the king that French cardinals in fact owed their rank. From Clovis to Louis XIII. the dignitaries of the Church had exerted great and beneficent influence in the affairs of the state. Some of the most glorious chapters in French history were those in which the counsels of cardinals had guided the steps of kings. Why, now, should those whose learning, piety, and talents had been rewarded by this great dignity, be branded as unworthy to become their country's servants?

The lawyers and judges who advocated the measure were not lacking in arguments. Those who were chosen cardinals, they said, took an oath of fidelity to the Pope. Even if they owed to the king their nomination, no sooner had they obtained the dignity than they became the senators and coadjutors of the pontifical power, and imagined themselves to possess a portion of his authority. Clad in the imperial purple, they sought first the power and glory of Rome, and afterwards considered the welfare of their own country. By the Council of Basle, cardinals had been declared the very entrails of the pontifical authority. They were bound more closely to the Pope than to the parents to whom they owed their lives, or the sovereigns to whom they owed their obedience. French history showed the truth of these statements. The Cardinal of Amboise had used the armies of Louis XII. in an endeavor to intimidate Italy and compel his own election as Pope. When in 1614 the great question was discussed, whether any authority could excommunicate kings and release subjects from their fidelity, the Cardinal du Perron had stirred up dangerous resistance to the maxims that were demanded for the safety of the state. Even Cardinal Richelieu had advised the sovereign to release valuable rights which he held in church property.[1]

After some delay Anne gave her consent to this edict of the Parliament. Retz had made little opposition to the measure. He knew that as soon as the king wished to

[1] Journal du Parlement, 52–54. Mss. Bib. Nat., 4210., 332, *et seq.*, despatch of April 7th. Talon, 419–422, 427–429.

disregard such an edict, he would do so without a murmur from those who had advocated it most loudly. Such was the fact, and in less than a year a cardinal was again chief minister. As with most edicts which enacted any constitutional change, the king had no thought of regarding them, the Parliament no power of enforcing them, and those who clamored for their enactment sought only some personal and temporary end.

More interest was excited by the changes in the ministry. The regent had attempted to conciliate Condé by the most liberal promises.[1] He was offered the government of Guienne in place of that of Burgundy, while Provence was to be given to his brother in exchange for Champagne. These governments would give them great power in the south of France. Guienne was disaffected and the name of Condé was there one to conjure with. He could be in that province almost an independent prince, and through his brother he could exercise equal authority in Provence.

Changes in the ministry were also suggested, which were acceptable both to Anne and to Condé. Chavigni had long been in retirement. He was a friend of Condé and hostile to Mazarin. But the cardinal now advised that he be again taken into the ministry, hoping with him as with Condé to overcome past aversion by present favor. "It is necessary," he wrote, "without losing a moment, to inform Chavigni in advance of what I have done for him, and of the resolution her majesty has taken at my supplication."[2] On the 2d of April, Chavigni arrived at Court. He was taken up a private staircase and received by the queen in her oratory. On the third he took his seat in the council. When Orleans found him seated at the council table, he said to the regent that he was amazed to find that without consulting him she had introduced a minister into the king's council. "You

[1] On March 14th, Morosini wrote that Anne's favor to Condé would soon destroy the good intelligence between him and Orleans. Dis. Ven., cxiii., 7.

[2] Aff. Etr., t. 267, Letter of Feb. 25th.

have done so many things lately without consulting me," said Anne, loudly, "that you must not be surprised if I do the same." Condé watched the dispute with a malicious pleasure, though he took no part.[1]

Another change had been greatly desired by Anne. Chateauneuf had been selected by the Importants and by the Frondeurs as Mazarin's successor, and the choice had done him no good in the regent's eyes. His aged gallantry made him ridiculous to her, and his ambition and his jealousy of Mazarin made him odious. Condé's family were also hostile to him. When Mazarin fled from Paris, Chateauneuf found himself in the position which he had so long desired. He was nominally prime-minister. He hoped that now at last offices would be at his disposal, foreign politics be regulated by his judgment, masters of ceremonies would bow low before him, and ladies would overlook declining years in the chief minister of the king. His hopes were doomed to a bitter disappointment. He soon discovered, what every one else discovered, that the affairs of the crown were guided by the minister at Brühl, and not by the minister at Paris. Anne hardly concealed her disfavor, and the signs of coming disgrace became plain. Chateauneuf had imagined that he might be made cardinal instead of Retz, and he regarded the edict against cardinals as one which would be injurious to his fortunes.[2] He was in little danger of being affected by it, but he declared that he would never place the seals to such an edict. Anne intimated that she would relieve him of the necessity.

In the evening of the same day that the queen approved the edict in reference to cardinals, a messenger waited upon Chateauneuf and demanded of him the seals. The unhappy man surrendered them, and they were forthwith given to Matthieu Molé.[3] Molé's courage and upright-

[1] Mss. Bib. Nat., 4210., 335, *et seq.*, Tellier à Mazarin. Motteville, 392, 393.

[2] Mazarin also suggested that Chateauneuf might be nominated as cardinal. He doubtless thought he would be less dangerous than Retz.

[3] Talon, 429, 430. Motteville, 393. Tellier to Mazarin, April 7th.

ness made him popular with the people without making him hateful to the regent, while for Condé he had displayed an active zeal. His nomination was one which Mazarin had advised, and which was approved by all except Orleans and his immediate followers.[1] The announcement of these changes created mingled surprise and dismay. It showed that Anne was still resolved to hold the control in her own hands, and it was another proof that absence had not affected Mazarin's ascendency. Such an attempt by the regent to exercise her own will in the choice of ministers nearly caused renewed violence in Paris. When Chateauneuf found the seals of office were taken from him he was plunged in an agony of rage and chagrin. He regretted that he had obeyed the queen's orders, and that he had not gone to the Luxembourg, demanded the protection of Orleans, and dared death with the seals of office rather than life without them.[2]

In the meantime a fierce debate already raged at the palace of the Luxembourg, as to the course which should be followed after the appointment of Chavigni. At about eleven in the night the news was brought of Chateauneuf's disgrace. At the conference Orleans, Retz, Condé, Beaufort, Rochefoucauld, Mme. de Chevreuse, and other leaders of the Fronde were present. Orleans was full of fire and fury, and he asked their advice on the steps that were proper in view of the queen's endeavor to act independently of their control. Several said that a force should at once be sent to Molé to demand of him the surrender of the seals. Retz advised that guards should also be stationed along the quays, and declared that Beaufort and himself would answer for the populace. "I will speak for myself, Monsieur, when my turn comes," sharply interrupted Beaufort. The company were thunderstruck by this proof of internal discord. Condé at once followed, and declared that he was not a master in a war of chamber-pots, and that he would

[1] Aff. Etr. France, 268., 85. [2] Motteville, 393, 394.

confess himself a poltroon where brick-bats and cobble-stones were flying. If Orleans felt so outraged that he must begin a civil war, Condé said that he would retire into Burgundy and leave the duke free to exhibit his courage in Paris. The prince and his followers shortly retired and, as they went down the steps of the palace, their jests and laughter were heard over the war of the chamber-pots. The women of the conference demanded of Orleans to order their immediate arrest, but the valor of the duke had already oozed away, and Condé's desertion left him in the lowest stage of fear and uncertainty. He began to whistle, which Retz declares was always an unfavorable sign. Presently he slipped into his library and sent his farewells to the company.[1] The conference dispersed and it was followed by neither mobs nor barricades.

Shortly after this rupture the engagement between Conti and Mlle. de Chevreuse was abruptly broken. After the princes were released, they had freely ratified the treaties by which their liberty had been gained. Retz offered to relieve Condé from the engagement to marry his brother to Mlle. de Chevreuse, but the prince angrily asked for what manner of man he took him.[2] Conti visited Mlle. de Chevreuse, whom it had been promised he should wed in the face of the Church. Pleased with her beauty he saw her often, and seemed an eager lover. In March great preparations were making at the Hotel Chevreuse for the approaching marriage. Three of Mazarin's tapestries, the Scipio, the Paris, and one of green and gold, which he had pledged to raise money, were taken by Mme. de Chevreuse to add to the decorations of her palace.[3] This was the most important of the

[1] Retz, iii., 57–62. Motteville, 394. Rochefoucauld, 250–252. Dis Ven., cxiii., 33. Motteville says that Beaufort offered his services to stir up commotion in Paris. Retz was present at the interview and, as he had no motive to color it, his account is probably substantially correct. It is somewhat differently related in a letter of Le Tellier of April 7th Mss. Bib. Nat., 4210., 337, *et. seq.*, but I do not think that he had as good facilities as Retz for knowing what was said.

[2] Retz, iii., 52.

[3] Aff. Etr., t. 267, Letter of April 1st.

alliances, by which the Palatine had planned to unite the great aristocracy for the control of the kingdom. Mme. de Chevreuse was related to the houses of Lorraine and Rohan. By her daughter she held Retz firmly bound, and through her allies and her political genius she could exercise a great influence in the councils of the Fronde. The marriage of her daughter to the House of Condé would bring to it more power than the government of Guienne or the hat of a cardinal. The daughter herself was no more immoral than most women of her rank, and was much more beautiful. It is impossible to trace accurately the causes which led to the insulting and ill-advised rupture of this alliance, but to the influence of Mme. de Longueville it must probably be charged. She had no desire to see her brother taken from her control to become the husband of a woman younger and more beautiful than herself. The new Princess of Conti would take precedence of her. She would walk before her at balls and make her courtesy first at the Court. Her brother would be controlled by the beauty of his wife and the sagacity of his mother-in-law. It was easy for Mme. de Longueville to induce Condé to oppose the marriage. If the face of Mlle. de Chevreuse had made any impression on Conti, this could be dispelled by reports only too well authenticated of the relations of his future bride with the coadjutor.

The Condés hardly deigned to give an excuse for their action. It was, indeed, stated that the regent had refused her consent to the alliance, as made with designs prejudicial to the state; but with Condé's position he could have obtained the queen's approval of his brother's marriage, if he had seen fit to demand it. Anne, however, was quite ready to refuse her consent, for the rupture of this projected alliance immediately dissolved the great combination that had been so carefully and laboriously made. It had lasted for two months and a half, and so had exceeded the ordinary duration of the political alliances of the Fronde.[1]

[1] This engagement was broken on April 15th. Aff. Etr. France, t., 874, p. 117. Dis. Ven., cxiii., 41. Tellier à Mazarin, April 28th, Mss. 4210., 351, 352.

Orleans continued inflexible in his hostility to the first president, and Condé consented to sacrifice him to the duke's demands. Such a sacrifice was the easier for the prince because Molé had been active in his behalf during his imprisonment. The feeling of obligation was to Condé of all feelings the most distasteful. Beaufort was fortunate, he said, because he owed his escape only to a few of his domestics, and so found himself free without any onerous debt of gratitude. The regent informed Molé that she must consent to his retirement to appease Orleans, but she besought him to suffer with patience this sacrifice for the good of the state. She offered him the nomination for a cardinalate or 100,000 crowns in money. Molé said his nomination as cardinal would not be favorably received at Rome, and that the treasury was in no condition to pay out such a great sum of money. He retired with dignity to his judicial position, but he was little pleased at the loss of the seals.[1] He did not forget that Condé rewarded his services by desertion, and another powerful influence was arrayed in stately but implacable hostility against the prince. The seals were given to Chancellor Seguier, who was called back from retirement to enjoy again his former dignity.

Mazarin, in his letters, protested against the enormous offers which had been made to Condé, though they were made in the hope of purchasing the prince's friendship for the regent and himself. Condé, he said, wished to establish his power by the abasement of the royal authority; he was insatiable in his desires, he was ungovernable in his passions, he was untrustworthy in his promises.[2] Mazarin's letters were full of plans for his own return, and he complained often that Servien, Lionne, and Le Tellier were neglectful of his interests and deceitful in their professions of zeal for his restoration. But he did not lose sight of the interests of the state, and he was unwilling

[1] Le Tellicr à Mazarin, Mss., 4210., 348, 349. "M. le President a rendu mal volontiers les sceaux et très mal satisfait de ce changement." Mazarin expresses his regret at Molé's retirement.—Mss., 4209., 232.

[2] Aff. Etr., 267, Let. of March 9, 1651.

that his return should be bought by making an unruly prince more powerful than the king. "The greatest happiness the cardinal has," he wrote the queen, "is that his return was not stipulated in the accommodation by which the prince was accorded establishments that sooner or later would ruin the king; for the cardinal would have been in despair to see himself reëstablished by means so prejudicial to the state." [1]

His return had not, indeed, been secured even by all that was offered the prince, and possibly that sharpened his reproaches against Lionne and his associates for having sacrificed to Condé the interests of the state.[2] Guienne and Provence, he justly said, were unruly provinces and adjacent to Spain. Already Condé was again negotiating with the Spanish, and once in command of these great governments, he could ally himself with the king of Spain and bid defiance to the king of France.[3] While Mazarin's letters were full of reproaches towards Lionne, Le Tellier, and Servien, who were regarded as his creatures and believed to be devoted to his interests, the devotion of the queen was so steadfast that even the cardinal's suspicions were not aroused. He had confirmation of her good-will from her own letters, and he received assurance of it from other sources. A correspondent writes him: "I have the honor to speak almost every day with the queen, who says that you show distrust of those who surround her. She is in despair that affairs do not progress as rapidly as she would desire. For herself she would give her life to serve you, and this she says with incredible tenderness. Again, when walking at Ruel, she asked me if I had not seen her emotion while there, because she felt as if she must die of displeasure when she remembered how she had formerly seen you walking those paths amid so much splendor and with so great a following." [4]

Mazarin's letters to the queen are full of protestations of

[1] Lettres de Mazarin à la Reine, 44, 68–70.

[2] Lettres de Mazarin à la Reine, 73.

[3] Aff. Etr. France, 267., 421, *et seq.*

[4] Aff. Etr. France, t. 875, p. 54. Cited by Cheruel, iv., 333, 334.

a fervid devotion, which show their relations were not only those of subject and prince, but of lover and beloved. "My God," he writes her, "how happy I would be if you could see my heart, or if I could write you what is in it. I did not suppose my friendship would deprive me of all contentment when I employ my time otherwise than in thinking of you, but so it is."[1] "Since your majesty wishes that ceremonies should be banished," he writes again, "I obey with much pleasure. * * * There is timidity and feebleness among my friends, but so the world has always been. You must be excepted, for you forget yourself, when there is a question of my interests, and as the example is rare, you may infer what sentiments I have for such friendship."[2] "All the letters of the queen are more touching than those of Balzac or Voiture, and in eight days they have been read ten times."[3] "I thank you for the letters you have sent me, and they have greatly consoled me. I have read them with pleasure for they are so conceived that one sees well it is the heart which speaks. * * * But I would fain know when the time will come that there will be no more need for writing or reading."[4] "Mazarin dies for the queen. If he could send his heart there would be things seen which cannot be imagined."[5] "After reading the letter of the queen, he was so moved that he wept for an hour. * * * Those who seek to injure the cardinal in the mind of the queen will gain nothing, for they are united by bonds which you yourself have more than once acknowledged could not be broken by time nor by any effort."[6]

The queen had gone far in her efforts to please Condé, in the hope of inducing him to favor the return of Maza-

[1] Let. de Maz. à la Reine, 30, 31.

[2] *Ibid.*, 87. These letters are largely in cipher and often in the third person, but I have translated them as they were understood.

[3] *Ibid.*, 202. [4] *Ibid.*, 219, 220. [5] *Ibid.*, 236, 237.

[6] Cipher symbols of affection constantly occur in the letters. "I am a thousand-fold . . ." he ends one of his letters, using a cipher which is frequently employed to denote the affection between them. "Adieu," he writes, ". . . to the last sigh of my life."—Let. à la Reine, 281, 352. See also Mss. Bib. Nat., 23,202., 26, etc.

rin, but without success, and now negotiations were actively carried on with the other faction.[1] Immediately after the rupture between her daughter and Conti, Mme. de Chevreuse had directed that the cardinal should be informed there were sure means to serve him if he would advise the queen to confide in her.[2] The Princess Palatine was also weary of her allies, and entered into a secret and confidental correspondence with Mazarin to aid his return to power and gain advantages for herself. Through Chevreuse and the Palatine, Retz was brought to promise his assistance to the cardinal. After the rupture which followed the appointment of Chavigni, the coadjutor had decided to retire from politics into pious solitude. He said that having driven Mazarin into exile and released the princes, he could now devote himself solely to the duties of his sacred office. He accordingly announced that he was to enter the cloister of Notre Dame and attend exclusively to the exercise of his profession. Orleans showed manifest relief at the retreat of this turbulent adviser, who kept him from the timid courses he liked best. Conti congratulated the pious hermit. The Prince of Condé looked his surprise, and Madame de Longueville received the farewells of Retz with indifference.[3] In the cloister Retz devoted himself to holy works, and even administed confirmation in several of the parishes of the city.[4] He did not, however, abandon himself so entirely to Providence as to disregard human means to protect himself from his enemies. He issued various pamphlets filled with praise of his own conduct, and with covert attacks on the Prince of Condé,[5] and he went from his parish labors by day to the Hotel Chevreuse by night. His devotions at the cloister were interrupted by messengers who summoned him to the Palais Royal. Retz visited the queen secretly, and declared that he would

[1] Lettres de Mazarin à Lyonne, May 29th, June 9th, 14, *et passim*. Aff. Etr. France, t. 267. [2] Aff. Etr. France, 267., 358. Dis. Ven., cxiii., 54.
[3] Retz, iii., 64–67. [4] Joly, 50.
[5] "Defense de l'ancienne et légitime Fronde." "Avis disinteressé sur la conduite," etc., etc.—Choix des Mazarinades.

compel Condé to leave Paris within eight days. Anne assured him that if he could do this he should receive the nomination for the cardinalate.[1]

The new allies at once deliberated on what steps should be taken to get rid of the prince. He was already discontented at the failure of the queen to give him all that had been promised, and he no longer visited the Palais Royal. Though the Swiss guards were unpaid and the queen's household was in need, money had been given Condé, in order, if possible, to prevent another civil war. He had received the government of Guienne, but the queen hesitated about making his brother governor of Provence. Condé had lost the support of many who had been eager in his cause, and his greed and ingratitude reduced the number of his followers.[2] Retz advised that the prince should be arrested when he was visiting Orleans, but fearing lest Condé should be left entirely in the power of the Frondeurs, Mazarin disapproved of this plan.[3] Some even advised Condé's murder, but such a course was shocking to the queen, and Retz claims was equally distasteful to him.[4] It was decided, however, that the prince should be arrested, but the intelligence of this design was at once conveyed to him through Lionne and Chavigni. Though bold on the field of battle, Condé was very apprehensive of finding himself again in confinement, and a groundless alarm caused his retreat from Paris.[5] A company of guards was sent to one of the gates, to see about the

[1] Retz, iii., 73–82. These intrigues were probably begun by Retz. On May 29th, Mazarin writes the Abbé Fouquet, "that the coadjutor might feel assured of his friendship."—Mss. Bib. Nat., 23,202, p. 6, in cipher.

[2] Dis. Ven., cxiii., 61, *et seq.*

[3] Aff. Etr. France, 267. Mazarin à Lyonne, July 15th.

[4] Different versions are given of this, some saying that Retz and Mme. de Chevreuse suggested the prince's murder, and others that they refused to adopt such a plan. There was nothing in the character of either to make it incredible that they would be willing to resort to such a measure, but it is not certain that they advocated it in this case. See Motteville, 398; Retz, iii., 98, 99; Montglat, 251.

[5] Morosini was of opinion that Condé's fear of arrest was only a pretext, and that his retreat was to drive the queen to give Conti the government of Provence. Dis. Ven., t. cxiii., 126.

entry of some wines, free from duties. They were observed by Condé's domestics, and he decided that this was an enterprise formed against his liberty or his life. He resolved to fly at once, and early in the morning of July 6th, accompanied by a few attendants, he rode out of Paris, and retired to his chateau at St. Maur, two leagues from the city. In this retreat, where Catherine de Medici had once dwelt, but which had now long been a possession of the house of Condé, his followers gathered to decide what steps should next be taken.[1]

During the day Condé was visited by the Marshal of Gramont, in behalf of the regent and Orleans, assuring him there were no plans against his person, and that he could return in safety. The messenger had been sent for effect, and he was received with disdain. Condé met him in the outer court, and in the presence not only of his friends but of his servants. There he informed the marshal that he could put no confidence in the queen while she was surrounded by the creatures of Mazarin. She was skilled in deceit, and he would trust himself to her no more. As for Orleans, he besought him to make no promises which he would not be able to keep.[2] On the 7th the matter was brought before the Parliament. Whatever secret negotiations were pending in Mazarin's interest, the hostility to him had as yet lost little of its fierceness in the Parliament or among most of the political leaders. Conti, in his brother's behalf, complained of the secret influence of the cardinal; he said that messengers were constantly passing between Paris and Brühl, and that at Brühl and not at Paris was the country governed. Condé sent a letter to the body, saying that he would return to Paris when the three ministers were dismissed who were merely valets of Mazarin. The Parliament was bitter in its hostility to Mazarin, and it was unanimous in requesting the regent to repeat what she had already promised,

[1] Rochefoucauld, 261–7. Retz, iii., 108–115. Motteville, 398, 399.

[2] Aff. Etr. France, 874, p. 4. Dis. Ven., cxiii., 123, 124. Mss. Bib. Nat., 4210, Le Tellier to Mazarin, July 7th. Morosini says Condé spoke politely of Orleans.

that the cardinal should never be recalled. Amid great tumult it was declared just that the prince should be satisfied, and that all vestiges of Mazarin's power should be destroyed. Both Retz and Orleans united in these demands. It had been agreed that Retz and his associates should not be required to undertake any public defence of Mazarin. To speak in his behalf would have deprived them of influence either in the Parliament or the city, and have rendered their alliance of no value. The only debate was whether the regent should be asked to dismiss from her counsels Lionne, Le Tellier, and Servien, the ministers who Condé declared were acting only as agents for Mazarin's restoration. It was finally agreed that a milder course should be used. The queen was asked to give a new declaration against the cardinal, and to grant to the Prince of Condé all the surety necessary for his safety, but the offending ministers were not named, nor was their dismissal formally demanded.[1]

The situation of these ministers was doubly unfortunate. Owing their positions to Mazarin, he now complained of their remissness in his service. Lionne and Servien had become special objects of suspicion to him, and he charged that they were content that their benefactor should continue removed from power; that they made treaties with Condé, granting him enormous advantages without obtaining by these sacrifices the cardinal's return, and in all things had been guilty of duplicity and treachery, which made him lose faith in man.[2] On the other hand, Condé called them the creatures of Mazarin, who plotted his return and were governed by the utterances of the oracle at Brühl. Anne distrusted the ministers when they were complained of by Mazarin, but viewed them with favor when they were accused by Condé. She was

[1] Journal du Parlement, 1651, 12. Dis. Ven., cxiii., 124, 125. Talon, 435, 436.

[2] Untold pages of Mazarin's long letters to the queen are filled with such complaints, especially of Lionne. These letters do not show the minister in a favorable light. He appears suspicious, impatient, querulous.—Let. de Mazarin à la Reine, 128, 134, 135, 165, 169–173.

almost ready to dismiss them from inclination but very loath to dismiss them under compulsion. But it was thought best to satisfy Condé, that he might be put wholly in the wrong if he persisted in his hostile attitude. On July 19th Lionne, Servien, and Le Tellier retired from office and went to their country seats. Le Tellier was most favorably viewed by the queen, and he was dismissed with many marks of good-will and with assurances of a speedy return.[1]

Condé was ill pleased that the grounds of his complaints had been so speedily removed.[2] He cherished a grievance and had little desire to be without one. But on July 23d he returned to Paris and appeared again at the Parliament. The removal of the ministers did not satisfy him, and he now demanded that the queen should be required to declare that their dismissal as well as that of Mazarin was irrevocable. But his followers in the Parliament cried out against constantly bringing forward new and insulting demands upon the regent, when she had promptly done all that was required of her. The measure was lost, and this check irritated and annoyed the prince, who was offended by any opposition.[3] He did not for some time pay the customary visit of respect to the king, though he thundered by the palace, followed by a long train of carriages and accompanied by a great body of gorgeously arrayed officers and valets. At last he made a formal visit on the king and queen. The interview was a frigid one and the conversation was only on bagatelles. Condé claimed that he feared arrest and he did not go again to the Palais Royal.[4] It was evident that he was resolved to have the government of all Southern France given to his family that he might be almost an independent prince. Intelligent citizens feared that Condé's power would become so great that there would be little prospect of quiet for the kingdom.[5]

[1] Mazarin made frequent complaints of Le Tellier in his letters during the early part of the year, but ultimately he became convinced of his fidelity.—Mazarin à Oudedei, July 18th. [2] Dis. Ven., cxiii., 138.

[3] Talon, 438, 439. [4] Motteville, 405. Dis. Ven., cxiii., 145, 146.

[5] Dis. Ven., cxiii., 96, "Causa di poca quiete all' interno di questo stato."

Mazarin had long cherished the hope that satisfactory terms could be made with Condé. The interview at Havre had left his mind imbued with the idea that the prince was well disposed to him and by judicious measures could be drawn to his support. But all hopes of help from Condé had now faded away, and Anne, with the skilful assistance of the Palatine and Mme. de Chevreuse, turned her attention to cementing the half-formed alliance with the Frondeurs. Mazarin's negotiations with Retz and his associates had his own return for their final object. Though not formally promised, this was tacitly understood. Few of his new allies, however, desired to see him again at the Palais Royal, but they hoped that the future would enable them to receive the advantages of the alliance without having to accomplish its end. In June the cardinal had sent a secret messenger to Paris to see if the time was yet ripe for his return, and he complained that no arrangement was made for his restoration or for his meeting the queen. Servien wrote him that by October the condition of affairs would allow him to return to the Court. He answered that he would not wait till then, he would not wait a month; Retz and Chateauneuf were willing to consent to his immediate return, were it not that his interests were betrayed by Lionne, to whom the queen and the Palatine foolishly and blindly committed these negotiations.[1] But the regent and her advisers agreed on the terms which they believed the best that could be obtained, and the cardinal was obliged to submit to their decision.

During the summer the articles of agreement between the contracting parties were ratified. By them it was provided that the coadjutor, in order to maintain himself in the confidence of the people, reserved the right to speak in the Parliament and elsewhere against the Cardinal Mazarin until a favorable time came to declare for him without hazard. Mme. de Chevreuse, Chateauneuf, and Retz were to do all in their power to detach Orleans

[1] Lettres de Mazarin à la Reine, 154, *et passim*.

from the interests of Condé, without, however, making any direct propositions in favor of the cardinal. Chateauneuf was to be first minister, but the seals were to be given to Molé. Vieuville was to be superintendent of finances on paying four hundred thousand livres to Mazarin. Retz was to be nominated for cardinal and be made a minister immediately after the meeting of the States-General. Mazarin's nephew, Mancini, was to be made Duke of Nevers and then to wed Mlle. de Chevreuse, whose matrimonial future was a second time made one of the conditions of a great political combination. Various of the friends of the allies were to be properly rewarded, and they were to act together in perfect confidence for the ruin of Condé and the advancement of their own interests.[1]

Unlike most of the treaties of the time, almost every article of this was performed. Such a result was perhaps due to the fact that all the parties to it were acting in bad faith. Retz hoped so to cajole the Court that he could receive his promotion as cardinal without being obliged to take any steps to assist in Mazarin's return. He was entirely willing to oppose Condé, but he had no thought of helping Mazarin. Chateauneuf believed that, having obtained the position of first minister, he could continue to hold it. Mazarin desired to allure Retz by the nomination for the cardinalate, and to prevent his actually receiving the promotion. But by force of circumstances the treaty reached a more perfect fulfilment than the contracting parties had intended. Retz actually became cardinal, Chateauneuf was for a while minister, and Mazarin ultimately was restored to power. One article was never fulfilled, that which provided for the marriage of Mlle.

[1] Mme. de Motteville, 416–418. These articles were published by Condé, and were declared a forgery by the Frondeurs. Even if the alleged written treaty was suppositious, and some of its wording sounds as if it might have been devised by an ingenious enemy, the subsequent conduct of the parties and the performance of the alleged articles show that substantially such an agreement was made. The terms of it are discussed in the letters between Mazarin and his agents.

de Chevreuse; but there was no opportunity for bad faith in that. Within little more than a year death carried off the cardinal's nephew for whom so brilliant a destiny was waiting, and the frail beauty for whom so great alliances had been planned.

Anne was now ready to declare open war upon the Prince of Condé. She sought to excite popular favor by joining to a pronunciamento against the prince the required declaration against Mazarin. On the 17th of August a message from the king was presented to the Parliament, by which it was declared anew that Mazarin was forever to be excluded from the kingdom. After this, which was a reiteration of what had been proclaimed before, and was promised with as little sincerity now as then, the message proceeded to arraign the Prince of Condé for ingratitude, insubordination, excessive greed, inordinate ambition, and a desire to turn the state upside down. These facts, it declared, could be no longer dissimulated without abandoning the rudder of the state which God had placed in the king's hands, and to such disorders he was resolved to bring a prompt remedy.[1]

The prince replied to this attack, that he had been unjustly slandered by his enemies. He doubted not, he said, turning to Retz in the Parliament, that he was the author of this calumny, which was worthy of a man who had advised that the seals should be torn by violence from one to whom the queen had seen fit to intrust them,[2] but he relied upon the Duke of Orleans to vindicate his honor. Orleans' tergiversations had placed him in a position more embarrassing than usual. He had promised assistance both to the queen and to Condé. He had heard the declaration against Condé read in the council, and had made some suggestions as to its form.[3] The prince now demanded of him to declare its falsity. In this embarrassment he betook himself to his usual resource, and said that he was ill. Two counsellors came from the Parlia-

[1] Registres de l'Hotel de Ville, ii., 203–210. Dis. Ven., cxiii., 161–6.
[2] Retz, iii., 212. [3] Motteville, 407.

ment to ask his attendance there, but he told them that he must be bled, and he could not come. Condé, however, was not thus to be put off. His messenger went to the duke's palace and compelled him to sign a paper, by which he stated that the charges in the queen's declaration were unfounded, and that he could not believe the Prince of Condé guilty of any designs against the king or the welfare of the state.[1] This certificate of character the prince presented to the Parliament on the 19th, and demanded his justification. Retz replied to Condé's assault on him, that he had done nothing unworthy of a man of honor, and for any thing he had said at the Luxembourg he would answer to the Duke of Orleans. The regent was always pleased with a spirited conduct, and she now asked Retz to carry on an open conflict with the prince. For this part of his engagement the coadjutor was ready. The idea of bidding defiance to the great Condé, of leading bodies of retainers and cut-throats, of being surrounded by gentlemen and hired ruffians armed to the teeth, of marshalling his followers against those of the greatest prince in France, the prospect of brawls in the streets, and vituperation in the Parliament, was congenial to his warlike and turbulent tastes.

Volunteers were plentiful in such a cause. The Marquis of Rouillac, famous for his extravagances, but as gallant as he was reckless, offered his services to Retz. Just after him came the Marquis of Canillac, whose character was much the same. He saw Rouillac, made his bow to Retz, and retired. "It is not just," he said, "that the two greatest fools in the kingdom should belong to the same party. I will go to the Hotel Condé." Thither he repaired, and enlisted on the other side.[2] The Fronde was a war of *bon-mots*, and in no period of history was there more wit and less wisdom.

On the 21st of August, between five and six in the morning, the followers of Retz began to gather about his

[1] Dis. Ven., cxiii., 166. Motteville, 410, 411. Journal du Temps Present, 54–63.

[2] Retz, iii., 215.

house. Both he and Condé were early at the Palace of Justice, accompanied by great bodies of armed retainers. Retz had fewer nobles with him, but he had a larger following among the people. The expectation of disturbance was such, that many of the counsellors and members of the court had swords and daggers concealed under their gowns. When Condé had taken his place, he said that he was astonished at the condition in which he found the palace. It was more like a camp than a temple of justice. There were military positions taken, passwords given, and companies acting under orders. He did not suppose there were persons so insolent as to seek to dispute the pavement with him. Retz replied that he yielded it only to the king. The presidents besought the two opponents to respect the place where they were and the safety of the city. Condé at last agreed to send Rochefoucauld to direct his followers to retire, and Retz said he would give similar orders to his. As he passed into the great hall of the Pas Perdus, some of Condé's followers drew their swords and, in a moment, hundreds of weapons were brandished in the hall. A combat seemed imminent, but by the exertions and coolness of a few men it was prevented. Retz now sought to return, but he reached a door at which Rochefoucauld had stationed himself. He tried to force an entrance, and Rochefoucauld caught him between the folding-doors and held him in that position, which was both uncomfortable and dangerous. "Kill him!" some cried, and Rochefoucauld confesses he was tempted to end Retz's turbulence by a death which he thought was merited. The people of the prince, he says, did not realize what a service they could render their master, and while they hesitated Molé's son arrived and rescued the coadjutor from his danger. He returned to his seat and, order having been restored, he accused the Duke of Rochefoucauld of having tried to murder him. "Traitor," replied the duke, "I care little what becomes of you." "Very good, Mr. Frankness," said Retz, giving Rochefoucauld his cant name among the Frondeurs, "you

are a poltroon and I am a priest, we cannot fight." "I lied," Retz remarks in his memoirs, "for Rochefoucauld was certainly brave."[1]

After this scene of turbulence the queen asked Retz to go no more to the Parliament, and he accordingly stayed away and avoided further possibility of bloodshed. The injury to his sacerdotal character, which he claims to have feared from these brawls, was but slight, for it was below injury. Some had cried as he entered the Parliament: "No Mazarin, no coadjutor." The familiar cry of "No Mazarin," greeted and encouraged Condé after his return from St. Maur, but an experienced Frondeur says that men had to be paid to do the shouting. It was not like the times past when it needed no hired brawlers, but all the world with one accord cried "No Mazarin," and the mouth spoke from the heart's fulness.[2] The citizens of Paris of every grade were wearying of these fruitless disturbances, and were beginning to think that Mazarin and order would be as well as No Mazarin and tumult. Retz was attacked as a man who sold himself for money and was gained by the hope of a fine hat; who put his favor at auction, was a Frondeur to-day and a Mazarinite to-morrow, and was only fit to sow schisms and preside among intriguers.[3] Still the advantage of this conflict was rather with the coadjutor. The great Condé had been openly defied by a priest, and if the result was evenly balanced that was shame to the prince and glory to his opponent.[4]

On the next day the coadjutor was in his carriage leading the procession of the Great Brotherhood, when the prince came from the Parliament attended by a band of his followers. The two processions met face to face. Some of the prince's followers cried: "The Mazarinite," but Condé stopped them, alighted from his carriage, and dropped on his knees as the coadjutor passed, arrayed in the vestments of his sacred office. Retz pronounced upon him,

[1] For account of this see Retz, iii., 213–229. Roche., 281–289. Motteville, 414, 415. Journal du Temps Present, 64, 65. [2] Joly, 52.
[3] Requêtes des Trois Etats, 1651. [4] Aff. Etr. France, 876, 130.

and upon Rochefoucauld who was with him, the episcopal benediction and the procession passed on. "God alone could decide," says the chronicler of the time, "if the benediction was well given and well received."[1] Retz was now in high favor with the queen, and Mme. de Chevreuse encouraged him to try to gain still more of the royal affection. "Seem pensive in her presence," said that veteran intriguer, who was familiar with all the resorts of gallantry as well as of politics. "Look constantly at her hands, of which she is vain. Storm against the cardinal." The queen was a coquette and not averse to the flattery of devotion, but Retz soon found, to use his own phrase, "That though the benefice was unoccupied, it was not vacant." Neither Mazarin's misfortunes, nor his absence, nor his complaints loosened his firm hold on the queen's affections.

The time had now come to which the cardinal and the regent had looked forward with eagerness and with anxiety. Louis XIV. had reached his majority and the perilous period of the regency was ended. Orleans and Condé professed still to desire the States-General, but they insisted they should be called to meet at Paris. The queen would only consent to summon them at Tours, and the Parliament did not wish them to meet at all. Mazarin had often written that some means must be found to postpone them. While a few deputies were elected, there was little public interest in the matter, and the proposed session was omitted without exciting notice or complaint.[2]

Louis XIV. was born on September 5, 1638, and by the law of France attained his majority on completing his thirteenth year. On the 5th of September two declarations were presented to the Parliament.[3] By one of them, Condé was formally exonerated from the charges made against him. It was hardly two weeks since they had

[1] Loret, 150. Retz, iii., 231, 2. Rochefoucauld, 289, 290. Dis. Ven., cxiii., 178.

[2] Mss. Bib. Nat., 4209., 256, 257, etc.

[3] Talon, 441. Journal du temps present, 75–77. The declaration against Mazarin was published in the Grand Chamber on the 6th

been solemnly proclaimed, but now it was hoped that by this reparation the prince would be drawn from his hostile position and the young king's majority would not be harassed by the revolt which was threatened. The other declaration sought to gain public favor by a denunciation of Mazarin so bitter that his worst enemies could have asked no more. It charged him with the imprisonment of officers of justice, the waste of the public funds, the delay of a general peace, the ruin of commerce, and the confinement of the princes. All the violations of the edict of 1648 were said to be the work of that bad man, who contravening the praiseworthy intentions of his majesty, had by his conduct justly excited the hatred and contempt of the three estates of the kingdom.

On the 7th of September, the majority of the king was celebrated with a pomp and splendor not unworthy of the reign so full of pomp and splendor which awaited Louis XIV. A long procession of nobles, officers, and soldiers marched through the streets of St. Honoré, St. Denis, and over the bridge of Notre Dame to the Palais de Justice. All were arrayed in that gorgeousness of dress which had not yet faded into the colorless costumes of modern times. They passed through an innumerable crowd which thronged the streets and filled the windows and the roofs of the buildings. The lieutenant of the Swiss guards was dressed in a habit of satin of the color of fire. His mantle was rich with gold and silver lace. Bands of satin ornamented his breeches, his shoes were red and his garters of silver and gold, while from his velvet cap waved a heron's crest with plumes sparkling with diamonds. The Count of Clère wore a doublet of cloth of gold, with crimson breeches of Holland camelet. Near the king rode the Count of Harcourt, grand equerry of France, bearing the king's sword in its sheath of blue velvet. His horse was adorned with trappings of crimson velvet. Finally came the king dressed in a habit so covered with gold that neither the material nor color could be seen. "His august countenance," says the

courtly chronicle, "and his mild and royal gravity made him remarked by all as the delight of human kind, and tears of joy were drawn from the spectators' eyes by his grace and majesty." The reign of flattery had begun.

Having reached the palace the king entered the Sainte Chapelle and heard mass. Marching from thence with one hundred Swiss preceding him and beating their drums, he entered the Grand Chamber to hold his bed of justice. The officers of the courts, bishops and archbishops, marshals of France, and the great nobility of the kingdom were there assembled. "I have come to my Parliament," said Louis, "to announce that according to the law of my state, I wish to assume myself the government, and I hope, by the goodness of God, that it will be administered with piety and justice." The queen then addressed her son and said that for nine years she had had charge of his education and of the government of the state. God had blessed her labors and preserved the person, which was so dear to her and to his subjects. She now gladly resigned her power, and hoped God would give the king grace to make his reign happy. "I thank you, madame," Louis replied, "for the care you have taken of my education and of my kingdom. I pray you to continue to give me your good advice." The king's brother and those present then rendered their homage. Edicts in favor of Condé and against duelling and blasphemy were read and approved. After this the advocate-general, Omer Talon, addressed the king. From Hector of Troy, from Alexander and Augustus, from the armor of Minerva and the prophet addressing Joshua, the orator drew lessons and illustrations for the young king. "The speech of the advocate-general," says a contemporary, "was very eloquent, but so long that it wearied all the company." It ended at last, and the procession returned to the Palais Royal. The fountains ran wine instead of water. In the evening illuminations and fireworks made the night as the day. "The earth," says the enthusiastic gazetteer, "added countless artificial stars to those of

heaven, as if to contest the glory of lighting this happy night, when joy was spread over all France.[1]

Thus auspiciously commenced the reign of Louis the Great, but ten years were to elapse before the king himself began to rule. Though legally invested with the government, Louis took little more part in its control than he had for the eight years that had already passed since he became a king. Physically he was tall and well-developed, but his intellectual qualities, never brilliant, were of slow growth. It has been charged that Mazarin neglected and stunted his education, in order longer to preserve his own power. There is nothing but the malice of enemies and the gossip of untrustworthy servants on which to base any such charge. Louis received little literary culture, but he received as much as most of those of high rank. His life showed that his training was sufficient to develop, fully and strongly, the natural tendencies of his character. He was not fond of books, and probably little endeavor was made to compel a royal pupil to study what was distasteful. But the regent and the cardinal seem to have taken an interest in his full physical development, and in imbuing his mind with those views which they deemed of importance for his future course. Louis submitted gladly to Mazarin's control while he was a youth, and in his mature life he cherished no feeling that his character had been moulded and trained otherwise than he himself would have wished.[2] Though the young king took as yet

[1] Talon, 441–446. Choix des Mazarinades, ii., 310–313. See account copied in Motteville, 418–422. Dis. Ven., cxiii., 185, etc. Journal du Bourgeois de Paris, Mss. Bib. Nat., 10,275.

[2] This view of Louis XIVth's education is not taken by all. It is, however, I think, correct. The letters of Mazarin and the queen show an interest, both active and rational, in their charge. The complaints of La Porte, on which many base their opinion, I regard as of very little value. He was a disappointed and untrustworthy courtier. St. Simon, in a well-known passage (xii., 13, *et seq.*), has complained of the neglect of Louis' education. His strong prejudices do not prevent St. Simon's statements from having great value. There is no doubt Louis was not a well-educated man, but there is nothing to show any intentional or specially blameworthy neglect of his early training.

little part in the control of his government, he commenced that life of solemn and wearisome display which for sixty-four years constituted in his own eyes and those of the world so important a part of his existence. The first valet of the chamber awakened him. His grand chamberlain and those who had the first entry came to view him when he had donned his shirt. The first gentleman of the chamber presented the holy water. The great multitude of those entitled to the second entry found the king putting on his shoes, which he did himself with skill and grace. They saw him kneel at his bed to say his prayers, and the clergy, and even the cardinals, who were there, knelt also. His meals were served and watched, his devotions offered, his pleasures pursued with the same elaborate ceremonial, when he was a boy at the Palais Royal, and when he was an old and broken down man at Versailles, and of this his somewhat stolid mind never wearied during more than sixty long years.

CHAPTER XIV.

CONDÉ'S REBELLION AND MAZARIN'S RETURN.

THE confidence which the government gained from Louis' reaching his majority, was at once shown by some changes in the ministry. They were mostly those that had been agreed on in the alliance with the Frondeurs, but they were made without asking the consent of either Condé or Orleans. The seals were taken from Chancellor Seguier, and again given to Molé. Chateauneuf was made chief of the Council of Despatches, and was regarded as first minister. The Marquis of Vieuville was made a duke and superintendent of the finances, a promotion which he owed to the friendly offices of the Palatine. He was a man about seventy years of age. In 1623 he had been appointed to the same office which he now obtained. He had been justly charged with corruption and removed by Richelieu. In his resentment he afterwards became implicated in the plots and intrigues of Monsieur and of Mary de Medici. His estate was declared confiscated, and he was condemned to death for contumacy in failing to appear before some court appointed for his trial. After the cardinal's death he had been declared innocent by the Parliament, and had begun again a career of unsuccessful intrigue. Now, at last, his ambition found a strong support in the favor of the Princess Palatine for his son. By her intrigues, and by the promise of 400,000 livres in ready money to Mazarin, he again obtained the office which he had held thirty-eight years before. He was to have a brief enjoyment of it, and then to have his ambitions and intrigues quieted in the grave.

The queen had already gratified her own desires by dismissing Chavigni. Mazarin's recommendation of him in the spring had done nothing towards removing the rancor which for eight years had festered in Chavigni's mind.[1] The cardinal justly regarded him as one of his ablest and bitterest opponents, and the queen viewed all men through Mazarin's eyes, and dismissed him from office.

The first prince of the blood had been conspicuous by his absence at the celebration of the majority of Louis XIV. Refusing to be appeased by the public declaration of his innocence, Condé retired to meditate rebellion at Trie. He was now in a position where he must either make his peace with the government, or soon find himself in armed rebellion against it. There had gathered at St. Maur a great number of partisans and nobles to consult and join forces with the prince. "There were an infinite number," says Rochefoucauld, "of those uncertain persons who offer themselves at the beginning of parties, and betray or abandon them when their fears or their interests demand." Condé's court was as well filled with persons of quality as that of the king himself. Balls, comedies and gambling, the chase, and good cheer were mingled with plots and intrigues.[2] Though discontented with the Court, Condé seems to have hesitated at the prospect of a civil war. His lady-love, Mme. de Chatillon, had been gained in the interest of the Court, and she advised measures of reconciliation. Rochefoucauld was variable in his counsels. The very keenness of the great satirist's mind, his ability to see every side of a problem, unfitted him for the rôle of a party leader. Rochefoucauld was said to spend all his mornings creating imbroglios, and all his evenings laboring for reconciliations.[3] He was becoming weary of the disappointments of rebellion, and willing to accept the more substantial advantages that came from favor at Court. But Mme. de Longueville,

[1] Mss. Bib. Nat., 4209., 269 *et pas.* Mazarin à Tellier. Mazarin claimed that Chavigni promised his friendship when he obtained his appointment, but such promises were rarely kept. [2] Rochefoucauld, 271. [3] Retz, iii., 118.

whom he had trained for a heroine, was now unwilling to abandon that part. The duke, her husband, was weary of rebellions the result of which was a prison. He did not care to risk imprisonment for the rest of his life in order to satisfy the immoderate ambitions of Condé.[1] He was now in his province of Normandy and expressed no political desire, except that his wife should cease to be the leader of armies and the lady-love of wits, and should return to her lawful spouse.[2] No prospect could have been so appalling to her. The duke was old and prosaic, and after her life of excitement to rejoin a gloomy and irritated husband, to lead a life of ennui amid the weariness and insipidity of provincial life was a peril from which she thought her brother should rescue her, even if he had to embroil all France in the endeavor.[3] "I do not love the chase, nor to walk through the woods, nor to play at games," she said; "I do not love innocent pleasures."[4] Her desire to begin hostilities was shared by others, and Condé finally resolved on that step. "They know little of parties," says Retz, who knew much of them, "who suppose that the chief of a party is its master."[5] "It is not from desire," said the Prince, "that I take my sword from its scabbard, but when drawn it will not easily return there."[6] But in truth Condé was full of discontent. He expected support in the south of France and aid from Spain, and believed that with his genius as a commander he could dictate terms to the king of France.

The third civil war in the course of four years was begun almost without the pretence of any motive, except that Condé was irritated and his followers needed excitement. Having resolved on war, the prince at once proceeded

[1] Dis. Ven., cxiii., 62.

[2] His daughter, the Duchess of Nemours, says this desire was attributed to the Duke of Longueville rather than felt by him, and that her stepmother need not have been so greatly alarmed by the peril she imagined.—Nemours, 645, 646.

[3] "Le dit duc se rend tous les jours plus difficile, soupçonneux et mesfient."—Carnet, vii., 2.

[4] Lettres de Madame, May 31, 1718. Dis. Ven. cxiii., 111.

[5] Retz, iii., 257.

[6] Priolo, 352.

southward. He received on his journey manifestations of popular favor which encouraged him in the step he had taken. Soon reaching his new province of Guienne, he was greeted at Bordeaux with every mark of public joy. He was popular on account of his own exploits and his wife's gallant conduct a year before. He came as the successor of the hated Duke of Épernon among a people who were ready for revolt. The Parliament declared in his favor, and asked the union of the other Parliaments in the kingdom.[1]

In this, as in all the rebellions of the period, those in insurrection at once sought an alliance with the enemies of the state. Condé had been negotiating with the Spanish for months, and Lenet was sent to Madrid to obtain a treaty with Spain.[2] He found a favorable reception from a people who hoped by fostering French discontents to recover what they had lost by French victories. Condé might gain for them as a rebel what he had won from them as a general. A treaty was signed betweed Philip IV. of Spain, and Condé, Conti, Rochefoucauld, Nemours, and Mme. de Longueville, by which it was agreed that Spain should furnish large sums of money and 10,000 men, partly in the south and partly in the north, the latter to act under the command of Turenne. The Spanish king was to be allowed to hold some post in the Gulf of Lyons until a final peace. No treaty should be made by either party until just terms were granted his Catholic Majesty, and satisfaction was given the Prince of Condé and his associates.[3]

Condé's example was followed by others of his party. The Count of Marchin was governor of Catalonia and commanded the French army in that province. He succeeded in seducing his soldiers from their allegiance, and

[1] Dis. Ven., cxiii., 197. Lenet, 527–8.

[2] Le Tellier wrote of Condé's intrigues with Spain, in May of this year, when the prince was an active member of the Royal Council. Mss. Bib. Nat., 4210., 379.

[3] This treaty is printed in "Mme. de Longueville pendant La Fronde," 387–400. It was signed subsequently by La Tremoille, Prince of Tarente.

led them to Condé's assistance, leaving Catalonia defenceless. Such atrocious treason in the desertion of his command in the face of the enemy was favorably viewed by Condé's followers.[1] But the prince found less encouragement when he sought the aid of some of his former allies. The assistance of the Duke of Bouillon and his brother, the Marshal of Turenne, was justly regarded as of great importance. Both had taken an active part in the uprising which had Condé's liberation for its object. Bouillon was one of the most powerful of the French nobility, and Turenne's military genius rendered him a still more valuable ally.[2] But they were now wavering in their support. Neither thought that Condé when liberated had shown any great appreciation of their services, or obtained for them any just reward. To them, as to all others, he had been ungrateful and overbearing in the hour of prosperity. "Among the prince's great qualities," Mazarin said, "he surely has not the gift of keeping his friends."[3] The cardinal fully understood the importance of gaining the support of the brothers, and he had instructed the queen to spare no exertions to that end.[4] In the bidding for their favor the Court could offer the most and it obtained their aid. Bouillon was to have an enormous indemnity for the loss of Sedan, and Turenne to be commander of the king's armies. He knew that the object of the revolt was only to advance the interests of a small number of persons without regard to the public welfare, and he had long been anxious to leave the rebellious courses which he found little to his taste.[5] Rochefoucauld had obtained from Bouillon a promise of his own and his brother's support. But they failed to respond and a little later, when satisfactory terms had been made, they declared themselves openly for the Court.[6]

Condé saw Longueville in person and extracted from

[1] Montglat, 255. Aff. Etr. France, 879, p. 11, etc.

[2] "Turenne chi era, si puo dir, il suo Achille."—Dis. Ven., cxiii., 126.

[3] Aff. Etr., 267, fo. 408.

[4] "Conservarsi l'affetto di questi due persone."—Mazarin à Oudedei, Aug. 11th.

[5] Mém. de Turenne, 433.

[6] Rochefoucauld, 292–7, 303.

him a promise of aid, but when the duke found himself safely in Normandy he left his brother-in-law and his wife to work out their own fate. The prince tried to gain the assistance of the Huguenots by granting favors to their churches, but they said that he sought only his own greatness, and was always ready to sacrifice his friends and his cause.[1] He endeavored also to obtain aid from Cromwell, and he offered to England free trade with Guienne.[2]

Orleans in the meantime remained at Paris in his usual fluctuating course. He formed no alliance with Condé; he did not espouse the cause of the Court. Retz still governed his conduct and sought to make him the leader of a third party, which, standing between the queen and Condé, should control the state, and itself be controlled by the coadjutor. Retz justly said that such a part was far above Orleans' ability. But to make out of judges and bourgeois, wearied of tumult, a party which should neither obey the king nor act with those in revolt against him, was a part beyond any one's capacity. Both Orleans and Bouillon endeavored to act as peacemakers between the hostile parties. Liberal offers were made to Condé for himself and his friends, but he was now in no mood to accept any terms. He sent word to Bouillon that it was no longer time to listen to propositions which would not be carried out. If he would declare in his favor, as he had promised, and Turenne would assume the command of the troops at Stenai, he would then be in condition to listen to the offers of the Court and make a treaty that would be sure and glorious.[3]

The majority had been proclaimed and Condé was in open rebellion. Anne and the council decided therefore to proceed to the seat of hostilities. Mazarin had long insisted on the king's leaving Paris. Away from there intrigues would diminish; it would be going from captivity to liberty. He would be king in fact, and not merely

[1] Retz to Charrier, letter of Oct. 26, 1651.

[2] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 29, Aff. Etr. England, 61., 34.

[3] Rochefoucauld, 305–306. Gourville, 502–503.

king in name.[1] No party in Paris was in condition to oppose such a step, though the bitter Frondeurs lamented afterwards, that when they allowed the king to escape from the city they committed a fatal error, and left open the way for Mazarin's return and triumph. There was some uncertainty as to whether the Court should proceed north to be nearer the scene of hostilities with Spain, or go south to oppose Condé. Anne favored the former course. It would bring her nearer to Mazarin and make it easy for her soon to meet with him. But Chateauneuf of all things most dreaded such a meeting and he insisted on going south, where Condé's active measures needed prompt attention. It was wisely decided that in the south was the most imminent danger. On the 26th of September Louis with his mother and his principal officers left Paris. They proceeded to Fontainebleau where they remained until October 2d, and then moved southward into Berri.[2]

Condé's success when commanding the king's armies did not attend him when he had taken up arms against them. Such forces as he could gather were for the most part ill disciplined, and his genius as a bold and dashing general in a pitched battle was little adapted to the semi-guerilla warfare which was now waged. Harcourt commanded the king's forces with his usual good fortune. Condé endeavored to excite the central provinces to insurrection and to save Guienne from being the seat of war, but he failed in both endeavors. Bourges opened its gates to the king. Cognac was rescued by Harcourt in the sight of the prince. Condé had hoped to enlist La Rochelle in his cause, and its governor, Daugnon, promised his aid. But the inhabitants of the city were weary of Daugnon's oppression and tyranny, and were now faithful subjects of the king. Harcourt marched there and obtained possession of the place. In order to attack the tower of St. Nicholas, Harcourt had a ship covered with

[1] "La meilleure nouvelle que je pourrais recevoir sera celle que leurs majestés soient hors de Paris," etc.,—Mazarin à Lionne, July 4th. Aff. Etr. France, 267. Mazarin à Millet, Aug. 8th. Aff. Etr. Fr., 268, *et passim.*

[2] Motteville, 424, 425.

plates of iron to protect it from fire. This iron-clad moved successfully up to the tower, and as the miners began to sap the walls the place surrendered.[1] Condé refused to accept the terms offered by Miradoux, and the town was defended with such vigor that it held out against its assailants until assistance could reach it. Some small skirmishes took place between the armies, with the advantage mostly with Harcourt, but though much superior in numbers he hesitated to risk a pitched battle against Condé. The prince was, however, obliged to fall back to Agen in Guienne, and the campaign was one of almost uninterrupted success for the forces of the king.[2]

While Condé was waging an unsuccessful war against the government, Paris continued in an uncertain position between the combatants. A declaration against Condé and his followers was presented to the Parliament in November, but Orleans had not entirely broken with the prince and he prevented its immediate registration.[3] Retz had at last obtained what had been so long promised. On September 21st he received the nomination for the cardinalate. It was sent to Rome, and the coadjutor at once began active intrigues to obtain the promotion from the Pope, before his nomination could be revoked by the Court. By gratifying this long-cherished ambition Mazarin hoped that he could now obtain Retz's active support.[4] He obtained the promise but not the performance. At the Court Retz professed hostility to Condé, to prevent the revocation of his nomination. At Paris he professed hostility to Mazarin to preserve his favor with the people, and in his heart he was resolved to do nothing to assist the return of the man, who distrusted him and whom he despised. If Mazarin was again in power his own prospect of becoming minister would fade away.

While Paris and its leaders endeavored to preserve a

[1] La Borde, "De Rebus Gallicis," 658.

[2] Rochefoucauld, 308–340. Dis. Ven., cxiv., 14, *et pas.*

[3] Journal du Temps, 115–137. Dis. Ven., cxiv., 47–51.

[4] Lettres de Mazarin à la Reine, Sept. 12th, *et pas.*

position of neutrality, Mazarin continued to prepare for his return to France. He had already been absent much longer than he had expected when he fled from the Palais Royal in February. His desire for a speedy return had been strong. A long absence would allow others to fill his place. Firm as he felt the queen's affection to be, time and absence might shake it, and he was alarmed at occasional reports that she consoled herself for his loss. Mme. de Chevreuse said that the queen's attachment for the cardinal could not survive eighteen months of absence.[1] He had hoped to secure his return through Condé's influence, and that hope had failed. Lionne and Servien had not procured it, and Mazarin complained had not really desired it. After the Palatine, Mme. de Chevreuse, and the coadjutor had allied themselves with the queen in the early summer, he believed that he could soon return to Paris, but his friends advised him that the time had not yet come.[2] His letters were full of querulous complaints that he was neglected and left in needy and hopeless exile.[3]

When Louis reached his majority, the cardinal felt sure that the hands of the government would be so strengthened that its favorite minister could be recalled, but as he read the fierce abuse with which he was attacked in the declaration, granted in September to soothe the people and the Parliament, he was filled with dismay. He wrote the queen on September 26th: "I have taken my pen ten times to write you, and have not been able. After the mortal blow which I have just received, I do not know if what I can say will have rhyme or reason. The king and queen have declared me a traitor, a public robber, inefficient, and the enemy of the repose of Christianity, after I have served them with so great fidelity and so

[1] Lettres de Mazarin à la Reine, 340.

[2] He wrote Fouquet in June, that the reports of his return excited the activity of his enemies and he saw little hope for his affairs.—Mss. Bib. Nat., 23,202., 26.

[3] "En un chemin d'aller à grands pas à la mendicité," he says in one letter, Mss. Bib. Nat., 23,202., 16.

great success. * * * The most zealous of ministers passes now for an infamous wretch. * * * He has been declared the most criminal and abominable of men. * * * It is no longer a question of wealth or repose or of whatever else. I demand the honor which has been taken from me." "I must be insensible," he wrote to Bartet, "if I were not troubled when my master has declared me in so ignominious terms a traitor, the enemy of France and of the human race. Siron will tell you the condition I am in, and the just reasons which I have for saying that I am the most unhappy of men." [1] But he was soon consoled by the assurance that it was not the queen's heart that had spoken in the declaration.

It was suggested that in view of the hatred felt against Mazarin, it might be well to have him attend to the interests of France at Rome; but he declined to return to his birthplace and beg alms from the Pope.[2] He had long advised the king's departure from Paris, and when once the Court was out of that city, he saw the way open for his return. For the Palatine and the coadjutor he now professed the warmest friendship, and he endeavored to obtain from Retz that open aid which the nomination for the cardinalate gave him the right to expect.[3] He surpassed even the usual exuberance of his professions of amity in his utterances about the coadjutor. "I assure you," he wrote the Princess Palatine, "that Mazarin will follow blindly the counsels of the coadjutor and Mme. de Chevreuse." [4] "I have been charmed," he writes another, "at all you send me from the coadjutor, and I learn with great pleasure the assurance of his friendship. I am sure he will never have reason to doubt mine. * * * I pray you give him my congratulations in advance on his promotion, and tell him that they come from the heart, and that I am persuaded nothing could be more advantageous

[1] Lettres de Mazarin à la Reine, 291–3, 301.

[2] Mss. Bib. Nat., 23,202, 14–16, letter of Sept. 18th, "à demander l'aumosne entre les mains du Pape."

[3] Mss. Bib. Nat., 23,202, pièces 6, 16, etc.

[4] Letter of Oct. 3, 1651.

for the king, and for my own interests, than to see him in possesssion of that dignity."[1] "This friendship," he writes again to the Palatine, "must be subject to no change. I see that the coadjutor and Mazarin have the same thoughts, condemn the same things, apprehend the same evils. * * * I beseech you to tell Retz that I will serve him sincerely, and that he will never have occasion to complain of me."[2] "My letters," he says again, "will have confirmed the coadjutor in the belief that I desire nothing more eagerly than to form an indissoluble friendship with him."[3]

A place in the ministry, the marriage of a niece of Mazarin to one of Retz's nephews, the assurance of the cardinalate, a practical duumvirate in which he and Mazarin should unite in the government of France, were suggested as baits to draw the coadjutor to an open and active support. But Retz was not to be cajoled by promises. He was himself full of fair professions, and Mazarin seems, during part of the autumn, to have believed, or at least hoped, that Retz was sincere in his alliance, and that he would declare openly for his return from exile. But the coadjutor could not be led to any open declaration. Mazarin sought to have a meeting with him, where they could agree upon the policy to be pursued. Retz professed himself ready for such a meeting, but objections were raised to every place that was proposed for it, and it never took place. While the coadjutor declared his friendship for Mazarin, he employed himself in working secretly against him, to prevent his again obtaining the power he had lost. In one thing he was sincere, and that was his hostility to Condé, and to the fear that he might ally himself with the prince and enlist Orleans and Paris in his support, he owed it that the Court did not revoke his nomination. "I have said a hundred times," Retz told a representative of the queen, "that I will make no terms with the prince if my nomination is

[1] Aff. Etr., France, t. 268, letter of Nov. 13th.
[2] Let. of Nov. 19th.
[3] Let. of Dec. 5th.

not revoked, and that I will make terms and don the Isabel scarf to-morrow if they even threaten its revocation."

Condé manifested his hostility by endeavors to prevent Retz's promotion as cardinal and even by attempting to kidnap him. In October, Gourville, a bold and unscrupulous adventurer, who had, by vigor and daring, raised himself from obscurity to wealth and esteem, together with a party of reckless followers, acting under Condé's command, resolved to seize the coadjutor, and carry him as a captive to Damvilliers. The prince would thus be freed from his restless opposition, and if in the scuffle that might arise the coadjutor were killed, that would be equally satisfactory. They came up from Guienne, and Gourville relates with much complacency that, funds being low, he captured a collector of taxes, took from him 5,000 livres and some horses, and giving him a receipt for the funds as taken for the service of the prince, proceeded on his way. Reaching Paris, they decided that Retz's nocturnal visits furnished the best opportunity for seizing him and conveying him out of the city. They lay in wait for him one night when he should come out from the Hotel Chevreuse very late, as was his custom, but he chanced to go home by an unaccustomed way. The plot was discovered and confessed by some of those engaged in it, and the coadjutor for a while escaped the prison to which his tortuous policy was slowly leading him.[1]

Mazarin now resolved to attempt the return, which had been so often forbidden and so long apprehended. He marched at the head of an army to join the Court and assume again the position from which he had been driven, and he abandoned at last the timid policy to which he was addicted. He left Brühl, hired an army of German mercenaries, and with this command he slowly moved nearer the French boundary.[2] The regent was eager for his return, but she was surrounded by those who advised against it. Chateauneuf had promised Mazarin his

[1] Loret, Muse. His., 180. Gourville, 498–500. Letter of Retz to Charrier, Nov. 27, 1651. [2] Aff. Etr. France, 268, Mazarin to Fabert, Oct. 22d.

aid, but he had no thought of giving it.[1] This, he said, was not the time for his return. The king's armies had been victorious over Condé. Soon all revolt would be subdued; but at this time for Mazarin to reappear would drive Paris and half of France to Condé's assistance. Some of Mazarin's friends, however, were of the opinion that he should come at once, and the queen preferred their advice. "The poor man," she said often, "when shall we see him again?"[2] On November 17th, Mazarin received instructions from the king to return to France and again rejoin the Court.[3] He did not, however, at once obey the summons. He was resolved that when he returned it should be with a force that should ensure his entry, and with which he could claim to be marching to strengthen the armies of the king. Some time was employed in raising troops and in negotiations with the Duke of Lorraine and with Cromwell. Though Mazarin had lamented the poverty to which he was reduced, he was still able, from his resources, to raise an army of 5,000 men, who wore the green scarf, the colors of the cardinal. At Dinant he issued a manifesto addressed to the king and explaining his return to France. He would have continued to live in exile, it said, if his misfortune would have contributed to the welfare of France. But instead of that affairs had grown worse, and everywhere were confusion and disorder. With the authorization of their majesties, he had resolved to employ his feeble resources for the defence of their cause—having for his only end to expose his life for the good of France, for his only wish the repose and glory of that kingdom.[4]

On December 24, 1651, he entered France. He was received by the governors and officers of the places where he went with the honors due the minister of the king, and the firing of artillery and military salutes greeted the returning exile. The Marshal of Hocquincourt, with 3,300

[1] Mss. Bib. Nat., 4212, Le Tellier à Mazarin, 260.

[2] Mss. Bib. Nat., 4230, Letter of Oct. 24, 1651.

[3] Let. de Mazarin à la Reine, 372–7. An order to lead his army into France was given Dec. 13th.

[4] Aff. Etr. France, vol. 268., 416.

of the royal forces, accompanied him in his march into the kingdom.[1] His progress was deliberate, but uninterrupted. He met with no more serious opposition than two messengers from the Parliament, who were sent to induce the cities and provinces to take up arms against his return. Hocquincourt captured one of the messengers, and the other took to his heels.[2] The cardinal proceeded through Champagne, crossed the Seine, and on January 16, crossed the Loire and entered Berri.[3] But though his return excited little feeling among the provinces through which he passed, it aroused fierce commotion in the Parliament and among the remnants of the old Fronde. In Paris there was indeed little excitement among the bulk of the population. The better and middle classes were for the most part beginning to weary of broils, and to think the presence of Mazarin no more odious than the turbulence and selfish ambition of those who stirred up civil war from opposition to his presence. Prosperous trade and the pipe of peace under Mazarin, might be as well as serving in the patrol and closing their shops under Orleans or Condé. But the Parliamentary leaders were still eager in the cause which was fast losing its popular support.

The declaration against Condé had been finally registered early in December by a vote of 124 to 40. To the last Orleans opposed this, but though he succeeded in delaying it, he could not prevent it.[4] Condé's followers endeavored to excite a riot in Paris. The mob burst into Molé's room, howling for peace, and accusing the present ministry, but he calmed them with his usual intrepidity, and the officers of the city took measures to prevent such disturbances.[5] Soon, however, Orleans was able to alarm the Parliament by sure intelligence that Mazarin was

[1] Mss. Bib. Nat., 4209., 304.

[2] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 88, 96. "Salvatosi l'altro con la fugga."

[3] Mss. Bib. Nat., 23,202, p. 269. Mazarin to Abbé Fouquet, Jan. 18, 1652, wrongly dated 1653. "Les habitants ont tesmoigné une veritable joye de mon retour."

[4] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 57, 58. The ambassador justly described the vote as 124 for the king and 40 for Condé. p. 58. Talon, 447–452.

[5] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 64, Dec. 12th.

attempting to return. The warnings of such a danger had been frequent, and when it was known that the cardinal was leading an army through France, it was no longer possible to disregard them. The most violent and factious of the popular tribunes obtained the ear of the Parliament, and on December 29th a decree was passed, which would not have been unworthy of the revolutionary tribunal. By it a reward of a hundred and fifty thousand livres was offered to whoever should bring Mazarin before justice, dead or alive. Should the person who might gain this reward have been guilty of any crime, pardon for it was to be granted.[1] The assassin who added to his other crimes the murder of a cardinal, would receive pardon for the past, and wealth for the future. This reward, which, as the advocate-general justly said, would not have been offered for the capture of bandits or pirates, was to be paid by the sale of the great library which Mazarin had slowly and laboriously collected for the use of the scholars of his own day and of all time. It was resolved to proceed at once with the sale of these books.[2] To gather them had been for Mazarin a labor of love, and he hoped to leave them as a noble benefaction to Paris, the city of his adoption. They had been collected from every quarter and at great cost. Even in his instructions to the generals, Mazarin often added to plans for a campaign, or for the capture of a city, the request that any rare or valuable book found might be saved and sent to his library.[3] Every endeavor was made to purchase the library as a whole, that its contents might not be scattered, never again to be collected. But the Parliament proceeded with an ignorance and malice which might have been expected from communists rather than from judges. During all the month of January, the destruction of the great library proceeded by the sale of the books in small lots.[4]

[1] Journal du Parlement, 1651, 158, 159.

[2] Journal du Parlement, 1651, 161. Dis. Ven., cxiv., 81. Talon, 458–460.

[3] See his letters *passim*.

[4] Colbert says that the members of the Parliament who had charge of the sale, stole many of the valuable books. Lettres de Colbert, i., 215.

"One could not re-collect them," lamented Mazarin, "in fifty years with a million of money. There were fifty-four thousand volumes. I had sent all over the world to gather the most curious. I had spent a hundred thousand crowns for a building proper to put them in. All this to make a present of them to Paris, and the Parliament has sold them at a ruinous price to use the money to murder me."[1]

This piece of brutal vandalism was not accompanied by any acts which might really have hindered Mazarin's return. The Parliament fired declarations at him, but it would do nothing towards firing cannon. A counsellor said that the soldiers under Mazarin's command would make merry over the deliberations of the Parliament, unless they were conveyed to them by bailiffs with good muskets and good pikes, but the Parliament decided that the enlistment of men of war belonged only to the king.[2] The judges contented themselves with sending a deputation to Louis, to inform him of the evils that would follow Mazarin's return, and to ask that the cardinal be driven from the kingdom, in conformity with numerous royal declarations. The deputation was informed that the Parliament doubtless was not aware that Mazarin had raised no troops save by the express order of the king, and that by his command he had entered France. While his majesty, therefore, would not censure what had been done, he doubted not that when the Parliament received this information and knew that the cardinal demanded only an opportunity to justify himself, it would set an example of obedience to the people of the kingdom.[3] The judges were put in no better humor by receiving this response. They endeavored again to excite opposition to Mazarin's entry into the kingdom, they invited the coöperation of the other Parliaments, and they

[1] Mazarin à Fouquet, Jan. 11, 1652, Cipher Mss. Bib. Nat., 23,202. *Ib.* 4209., 327, Mazarin à Le Tellier.

[2] Retz, iii., 292, 293. Journal du Parlement, 1652, 171, *et seq.*

[3] Talon, 460–463. Journal du Parlement, called "Histoire du temps present," 173–177.

declared the Marshal of Hocquincourt and all his posterity responsible if he refused to release the messenger of the Parliament of Paris whom he held a prisoner.[1] Having 7,000 soldiers with him, Hocquincourt was little alarmed for himself, and left his posterity to its fate. Nothing delayed the steady progress of the cardinal's army towards Poitiers.[2]

As the time for their reunion drew near, his letters to the queen show plainly enough the nature of their relations. "My God," he wrote in December, "when is it that the queen and Mazarin shall be happy!" "All shall perish," he wrote on the 26th, "or I will see you in fifteen days. In saying this, I am beside myself. Think, I pray you, what will happen when Mazarin shall see the queen." "When will it be," he wrote again in January, "that one shall have repose, and that Mazarin shall enjoy it near the queen! I will not begin to speak of that, for I should not soon finish. Believe only that I will be yours till the last sigh."[3] Anne was no less desirous for his return. Such was her eagerness, that the courtiers said the cardinal had either bewitched her or married her. "The cardinal is good and wise," she replied; "he has affection for the state, for the king, and for me."[4]

On January 29, 1652, Mazarin reached Poitiers where the Court then was. Louis with his brother went out two leagues to meet him, and the cardinal was driven into the city in the carriage of the king. It was said the queen stood for an hour at the window watching for him to appear.[5] The merchants and citizens of Poitiers con-

[1] Talon, 462. Retz to Charrier, Letter of January 19th.

[2] "Continua il Cardinal Mazarin la sua marchia verso la corte con la felicita piu desiderabile e riceve in tutti i luochi gli honori piu conspicui."—Despatch of Jan. 16, 1652.

[3] Lettres de Mazarin à la Reine 450, 467, 480. It is unnecessary to say that these letters are in cipher, but I have translated the symbols used to designate Mazarin and the queen.

[4] Letter of Le Tellier of Dec. 28th, Mss. Bib. Nat., 6887.

[5] Mém. de Joly. Talon says she received him with indifference, 463. Neither were eye-witnesses of the reception, and the gossip from the Court probably gave different reports.

gratulated him and expressed their pleasure at his return.[1] He did not immediately assume his position in the royal council, but he at once became the real head of the government. The members of the council were willing to be the instruments of his views. Le Tellier had been rewarded for his zeal by recall to office in December, but Chateauneuf's love for place could not reconcile him to the bitterness of holding it under Mazarin. He had sought to prevent or to delay his return, but that return was now accomplished. Full of years, and of disappointed ambitions, Chateauneuf retired to Tours and promised that he would not leave there without permission.[2]

A few days later than this, on the 19th of February, Retz received the promotion for which he had so long hoped and labored. His intrigues at the Court of Rome are a curious chapter in the religious history of the time.[3] Immediately on receiving the royal nomination, Retz had dispatched the Abbé Charrier as his confidential agent to secure his promotion from the Pope at the earliest possible moment. The abbé, by his unscrupulous zeal in intrigue, had received the appellation, not altogether appropriate to his religious calling, of "Charrier the devil." There was at Rome a field well suited for the exercise of the talents which he possessed.

The Pope, Innocent X., had long been under the control of his sister-in-law, Olympia Maldalchini. Whether her ability, which was great, or her personal charms, which were not small, had gained her this power, she possessed and exercised it without stint. She watched over the pontiff in his illness; concealed behind the curtain, she listened to his audiences with foreign ministers; ambassa-

[1] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 112.

[2] Mss. Bibl. Nat., 23,202., 29, Mazarin à Fouquet. "I would gladly have lived in friendship with him," Mazarin says, "but he was controlled by advices from Paris."

[3] For the account of Retz's intrigues in reference to the affair of the cardinalate, I am indebted to the curious letters of Retz which M. Chantelauze has discovered.

dors called on her as the representative of the papal power; her portrait adorned the palaces of cardinals, and her treasury was filled with the bribes of those who sought ecclesiastical preferment. "Olympia primus, Pontifex maximus," ran the satirical legend. A medal showed her on the one side with the tiara and the keys of St. Peter, and Innocent on the other with the distaff and the spindle. "Donna Olympia," wrote the Venetian ambasssador, "sells, taxes, hires, receives presents for all the acts of government, for favors and for justice. Pretty in her person, agreeable in her conversation, indifferent to all the princes, she is for him who gives the most." Her avarice was beyond all bounds. She was said to have established a tariff for ecclesiastical offices, to have demanded almost a third of their revenues, and to have insisted on payment in advance. From all this corruption and bribery she was thought to have accumulated a fortune of 25,000,000 livres.[1] The great palace Pamfili built for Innocent X., and the palace Doria Pamfili still stand, gorgeous results of this ill-gained wealth. In the Doria palace is a portrait of Olympia, showing her eager, stern, and determined. There also is the portrait of Innocent X., with his soft, expressionless face. "On a red chair, before a red tapestry, under a red hat, in a red cloak, a red figure —the figure of a worn-out pedant."[2]

With such a person as Olympia the coadjutor had not failed to be on friendly terms. "You will readily believe," says Retz, in his memoirs, "that it would not have been easy to induce me to give money for a cardinal's hat." We can judge of the truthfulness of this claim from what we find in his private letters to his agent. He raised and borrowed from his friends 450,000 livres—as much as half a million dollars now—and this vast sum, either in money or in the shape of precious stones and other costly presents, he put at Charrier's disposal. He writes: "I have 150,000 crowns at my disposition, which, in my

[1] For these details see Ranke, "History of the Popes," and "Vita di Alessandro VII.," by Pallabicino.

[2] Taine's Italy, 265.

judgment should not be spared if it were to gain only a moment." [1] "Be careful not to give your money injudiciously and unless you are sure of what is promised; but also spare nothing to succeed and find no fault with what is demanded." [2] "Above all, spare nothing to succeed, and by giving, giving, for you know the rascals of the country." [3] "I send you some embroidered English gloves," writes the archbishop to the abbé on the seventh of November, "to give to whom you wish, even to some of your own mistresses. Though you draw bills of exchange for 50,000 crowns they shall be promptly paid, therefore spare nothing, though it should advance the matter only by quarter of an hour." Intrigues and plottings made the coadjutor a hard-working priest. "It is five in the morning," he writes in one of his letters, "and I have worked since six last night, so excuse mistakes in the cipher. I pray God that the Pope will give a plenary indulgence to your rheumatic shoulder." [4]

Unfortunately for Retz, at the time of his nomination Olympia was under a temporary cloud. But the Princess of Rossano was then believed to be in high favor with Innocent, and the money at Charrier's command made it easy to secure her assistance. The secretary of state, however, was now Fabio Chigi, who had been the nuncio at Cologne, and afterwards became Pope Alexander VII. He was a man of a different stamp from the Barberini and the Pamfili, strict in his religious belief, inaccessible to bribery, stern against the abuses that had grown up about the papacy, and the infamous influences of such women as Olympia. Nothing gave Retz more embarrassment than dealing with an adviser of the Pope who objected to heresy, and was insensible to bribery. He was embarrassed between the desire of gaining Chigi's favor, and the fear of offending him by an endeavor to purchase

[1] Letter to Charrier of October 1st. These letters to Charrier, and the other letters cited in reference to these intrigues of Retz, are published in the second volume of the interesting work of M. Chantelauze, "Retz et l'Affaire du Chapeau."

[2] Letter of October 5th.

[3] Letter of October 12th.

[4] Letter of Nov. 25th.

it. All that Chigi was willing to accept was a ring, which could not with good manners be declined. Such virtue seemed problematical to the coadjutor. "Perhaps, after all," he wrote Charrier late in November, "what M. Chigi is seeking in all these difficulties is money as well as rings. Keep watch of that adroitly."

The nomination of Retz was favorably received by Innocent X. Retz had long been assured by those who stood near the Pope, that if he could obtain the royal nomination his promotion would easily follow. Innocent had never relaxed his hostility to Mazarin, and as the coadjutor had made himself hateful to the minister, he had become dear to the pontiff. When the nomination was officially announced to Innocent, he replied with a smiling face that the coadjutor was a good Frenchman and a good ecclesiastic. He felt great satisfaction that the king had recognized his parts and his fidelity.[1] The French ambassador at first solicited the Pope in good faith to accord the promotion, but soon his zeal in this behalf abated. Though the nomination of Retz was not revoked by the French Court, Brienne's letters presently suggested to the ambassador that he should nominally hasten the promotion and really delay it, that the Court might obtain from Retz a more active and open support. The fear that he would ally himself with Condé, kept for him the nomination, and during all these months of intrigue Retz believed, and believed justly, that the Court would not dare to revoke it.[2] But when the promotion was once accorded all hold on Retz was gone. There remained his promises of gratitude which he probably would not keep, and his ambition for the ministry which the queen did not intend to gratify. Only by forcing him to an open declaration for Mazarin and the Court, could the coadjutor be put in a position where possibly he might help and certainly he could not harm. The Bailly of Valençay was the French ambassador at Rome,

[1] Letter of the Bailly of Valençay to Brienne, of October 9, 1651.

[2] Letter of Retz, of Feb. 9, 1652.

and as he himself cherished hopes of being made a cardinal, he was willing enough to do what he could to delay Retz's elevation. He was not however in a position where he could accomplish much. A French consul at Civita Vecchia had been treated in an arbitrary and unwarranted manner by the officers of the Pope, and the bailly, after a violent interview, ceased his visits at the Vatican. He claimed, however, that the best way to retard the promotion would be to have it supposed that the French Court was eager for it, as he had to deal with a Pope who always wished to do the reverse of what the king desired.[1] An open and strenuous opposition to Retz's ambition was interposed by the Prince of Condé. Condé had no desire to see his inveterate enemy clothed with the dignity of the purple, and entitled to the precedence which the French Court granted to cardinals. He had for his agent one Montreuil, well known for his wit and gallantry, who amused the Pope, without however accomplishing much by the ingenious intrigues he endeavored to weave.

A more dangerous obstacle to Retz's pretensions was the charge that he was a close ally of the Jansenists and inclined to favor their heresies. The quarrel of Jansenism was then raging fiercely, and the Jansenists were regarded as little better than Protestants at the papal Court. They were believed capable of a dangerous insubordination to the papal authority, and the influence of the Jesuits at Rome was vigorously exercised against these enemies. The secretary, Chigi, when he himself became Pope, used all his authority for the overthrow of the followers of Jansen, and to him the accusation of a tendency to such beliefs was the most injurious that could be made. The Pope demanded of Retz before his promotion a written denial of any such heresies. No one was less apt to be involved in any doctrinal difficulties, than the coadjutor. He was neither a Molenist nor a Jansenist, and regarded questions of efficacious and sufficient grace with

[1] Letter of the Bailly of Valençay, December 11th.

philosophical indifference.[1] "It is wrong to accuse him of being a Jansenist," said a pamphleteer, "for, before a man can be a Jansenist, he must first be a Christian." The Abbé Charrier had been furnished with letters signed in blank to be filled in case of necessity, and he accordingly wrote over Retz's signature an equivocal denial of any tendency to Jansenism and presented it to Chigi. The coadjutor was much pleased with this device, and wrote approvingly to the abbé: "I know already all the interview you had with M. Chigi on Jansenism, and how to amuse him you wrote a forged letter, of which I much approve."

But Retz hesitated about committing himself in any formal manner on this subject. His political career had brought him in close relations with many disciples and friends of the Port Royal, who were largely found on the side of the Fronde. If he was disappointed in his hopes of promotion, to become a leader of the Jansenist movement might gratify his restless activity, and enable him to show the Pope that in rejecting a useful ally he had made a dangerous enemy. He directed his agent to suggest this possibility as one of the reasons for his promotion. "It is just," he wrote, "that I should sustain my position by doing either good or evil; which, will depend on the treatment that I receive. On this subject you must let yourself be understood, rather than speak openly, and as you have always been a great knave, I do not doubt that you will perform this commission well. Remember to suggest Jansenism as something in which resentment may engage me, though I have as yet taken no part in it."[2] "It is for the interest of the Court of Rome not to light a fire in France which would be extinguished with difficulty, and which would arouse spirits who are now sleeping in a Christian and submissive peace, but who little by little might even withdraw themselves from the obedience of the church."

He sent, however, in February a letter to Charrier which might be shown to the Pope, full of subtlety and eloquence, in which he claimed a righteous indignation that any such

[1] Guy Joly, 69. [2] Letter of Nov. 25th.

declaration should be asked from him, and said that he would rather die by martyrdom, than corrupt by temporal considerations the testimony of his conscience. He suggested, however, rather than asserted, in language worthy of a father of the church, the views which he held and his veneration for the church's head. A more ingenious letter was never written, nor a better example given of how far intellect, without conviction, can furnish the language of sincerity and religious faith.

Other considerations besides Jansenism were suggested to hasten the Pope's action. Retz made a cardinal could be a far more powerful adversary to Mazarin, whom the Pope hated. The States-General might soon be held and Retz would be a member. With a cardinal's hat, he would there be the powerful defender of the authority of the church. Without it, his great influence might be used in ways that would be prejudicial and dangerous.[1] There is little reason to doubt that Innocent intended from the first to make Retz a cardinal, but he proceeded with the deliberation always characteristic of the papacy, and he wished to make other promotions at the same time. The unwelcome news of Mazarin's return to France hastened the Pope's action. Retz had often suggested the possibility that his nomination might be recalled. "Claim always," he wrote Charrier in January, "that you fear a revocation. Not that, between you and me, I believe my nomination will be soon revoked, but it is well that you should talk in this manner." If Mazarin actually intended to revoke the nomination, Innocent at the last gave him no opportunity. The French ambassador was kept in entire ignorance of the Pope's intentions. On the 12th of February, the bailly wrote that he did not believe any promotion would take place during Lent, and that Providence was assisting the Court in its desire for delay, until the coadjutor could render service before receiving his recompense. The ambassador had been ordered to resume his visits at the Vatican, and had de-

[1] Letter, Dec. 18th.

manded an audience for Friday of the week of the 19th of February. On the morning of the 19th, the Pope announced the promotion of ten cardinals. Secretary Chigi was one of them, and Retz was another. His letter on Jansenism had not yet been received, but Innocent had resolved to delay no longer. "All the world agrees," wrote the bailly, "that the true reason for the Pope's decision was the fear that there should arrive a change in the French nomination." "Yesterday," said the *Gazette* of France of the 2d of March, "was received the happy news of the promotion made by his Holiness of the coadjutor of Paris to the cardinalate, which has spread an incredible joy in the hearts of all worthy men, who believe the great virtues of this learned prelate fitly honored by the purple. For one can form no other judgment, than that these are so many steps, by which he mounts to this sublime dignity of the church." Mazarin joined in the congratulations which the new cardinal received, but he ordered a severe reprimand sent to the ambassador for having failed to hinder the promotion. Retz had at last received this long-desired honor. It was to prove the end of his political career, and he claimed in after years to regret that he had obtained what he sought so eagerly, so skilfully, and so unscrupulously.

The alliance between Orleans and Condé, which had long been eagerly pressed by the prince and coyly declined by the duke, was brought about by Mazarin's return. Orleans said that he would rather become a Turk, than consent to the cardinal's reëstablishment.[1] On the 24th of January, 1652, a treaty was signed by which the two princes bound themselves to call together the States-General, and to make no peace until Mazarin should again be expelled.[2] In this treaty Retz did not join. Mazarin's threatened return had compelled him to take some definite position, and he declared to the Court, that while friendly to the cardinal, he must oppose his return. But the cardinal's

[1] Let., Dec. 16, 1651, Aff. Etr. France, 877.

[2] Aff. Etr. France, t. 88, pièce 60.

hat which he received kept him so far faithful to the interests of the king, that he did not ally himself with Condé, but continued to oppose that prince with pamphlets and subterranean plottings.[1] From all this turmoil of intrigue and confusion, he still hoped to find himself either the leader of a third party, or the successor to Mazarin's power. He was apparently willing, however, that Orleans should ally himself with the Prince of Condé and he nursed his hostility to Mazarin.[2]

Important military changes soon followed the new alliance, but the operations of the king's troops continued to be successful. In Anjou, the Duke of Rohan Chabot had invited the inhabitants to declare for Condé. This nobleman had become illustrious by marriage, and he was under deep obligations to the prince for his great fortune.[3] Henri de Chabot, a gentleman of Poitou, of no large estate gained the affections of Marguerite de Rohan, the daughter and the heiress of the name and great possessions of the heroic Duke of Rohan. It was said that his grace at balls and ballets attracted her attention, and that he danced into fortune. Such a marriage was far above the rank of Chabot, but he had been supported in his suit by Condé, had gained his bride, and had himself been made a duke, with the title of Rohan Chabot. He now attempted in Anjou to make a vigorous opposition to the king's forces. They proceeded to lay siege to the city of Angers, and all France was for a while in suspense, watching the outcome which might have produced important results, if the defence had been long and vigorous.[4] The command of the forces of Orleans was given to the Duke of Beaufort, and he attempted to lead reinforcements to the city. His movements were slow, and Rohan's defence was pusillanimous.[5] On the 28th of February the gates

[1] "Je périrais plutôt que de me racommoder avec ce traitre." Retz to Charrier, letter of Jan. 19, 1652.

[2] Mazarin à Fouquet, March 4, 1652. Mss. Bib. Nat., 23,202.

[3] For the family of Chabot, see "Histoire de Poitou" by Thibeaudeau, ii., 49.

[4] Rochefoucauld, 325.

[5] Letter of Beaufort, Aff. Etr. France, 889., 61.

of Angers were opened to the royal troops, and the important province of Anjou became subject to the royal authority. The Duke of Rohan had permission to retire to Paris. "He commenced as a Rohan, he has finished as a Chabot," said the Duke of Orleans.

In the south of France, the insurgents were no more successful. Harcourt continued his series of small victories, and Condé was harassed by the internal discords which had arisen in Bordeaux, and which were to be the ruin of his party in Guienne. He had been urged by many of his followers to leave that province, proceed toward Paris, and assume command of the forces which were assembled in that part of the kingdom. He was annoyed by the defeats his party had sustained, and impatient to leave a province with whose dissensions he was unfitted to deal, and where his scanty forces compelled him constantly to retreat before the enemy.[1]

On Palm Sunday he started on his journey, accompanied by only six followers, and disguised as a servant of the Marquis of Lévy. The party travelled with great rapidity and were exposed to many perils. In eight days they traversed one hundred and twenty leagues almost without change of horses, riding night and day, and several times barely escaping capture by the king's troops. The Duke of Rochefoucauld, who accompanied the prince, was suffering from the gout, and his son Marcillac was nearly drowned in crossing one of the morasses that rendered travelling dangerous in those days of imperfect communication.[2] Near the canal of Briare, several regiments were stationed and there was danger of encountering the king's troops at every step. The prince rode on, with Marcillac one hundred paces ahead, and Rochefoucauld one hundred behind, that he might be informed of any approach in either direction. Suddenly four horsemen appeared close upon them. Fearing that others had surrounded them,

[1] Rochefoucauld, 347. In November, 1651, Morosini wrote: "Multiplicano nella citta di Bordeos cosi numerosi le male soddisfationi di quelli habitanti contro il Principe di Condé," etc. Dis. Ven., cxiv., 49.

[2] Rochefoucauld, 356–365. Gourville Memoirs, 504–6.

they prepared to charge and die, rather than be taken, but the cavaliers proved to be friends.

On April 1st Condé arrived at the army of the insurgents and was greeted with much enthusiasm. The army had accomplished little under generals who were at once inefficient and inharmonious. While Beaufort commanded the forces raised by the Duke of Orleans, Beaufort's brother-in-law, the Duke of Nemours, had been sent by Condé to command the foreign soldiers furnished by his Spanish allies. Under Nemours' leadership these troops had marched into the heart of France, pillaging along the way, after the custom of the soldiers of the day, who made amends for the poor pay they received from their leaders, by the abundant plunder they extorted from the peasants.[1] Nemours wasted some time in Paris in festivities that were said to be carried on with such debauchery, that men and women became intoxicated together. The two armies then united, but the brothers-in-law were so hostile that they accomplished little though their forces were larger than those of the king.

In an unimportant skirmish at Jargeau, the Baron Sirot, the most skilful and experienced officer in their army, was mortally wounded. His military life had been long, varied, and brilliant. During fifty-five years he had gallantly assisted at the siege of many cities, which had all been taken, and in sixteen pitched battles, which had all been won. He had never passed through a siege or a battle without receiving a wound, and his body was tattooed with honorable scars. He had pressed near enough in battle to the kings of Bohemia, of Denmark, and of Sweden to have fired his pistol at all three, and claimed to have wounded them all. He received his last wound at this skirmish, and it was said his irritation, at being unable to be with his command when Condé joined the army, hastened his end.[2]

---

[1] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 147. The citizens of Paris were much distressed at the presence of 6,000 Spanish soldiers laying waste the heart of France.

[2] Letter from Paris of April 12., 1652, printed in the appendix to "Mme. de Longueville pendant la Fronde," Montpensier, 96, 7.

The only noteworthy achievement before Condé's arrival from Guienne was securing the city of Orleans to the cause of the princes. Like so many of the notable acts of the Fronde, this was the work of a woman. Mademoiselle, the daughter of the Duke of Orleans, was now twenty-four years old. She was the daughter and heiress of Orleans' first wife, and inherited the vast possessions of the house of Montpensier. Alike her birth and her wealth made her a proper match for kings and princes, and to matrimony Mademoiselle gave a constant and eager attention, which was to result in her dying unmarried at sixty-six. Her hopes had first been excited at nineteen, by the suggestion of marriage with the Emperor, who had just become a widower. The possibility of becoming an empress, and her desire for such a lot, led her, she tells us, to endeavor to form her habits for her fortune, and hearing that the Emperor was devout, she sought to immerse herself in the religious severities of the Carmelites, read only the life of St. Theresa, and listened to no talk save of Germany and the Germans. But the pious Emperor found consolation in another wife, and Mademoiselle abandoned the life of St. Theresa. There was next held out the prospect of an alliance with the Archduke Leopold, with Flanders to be set off to the new couple, and peace between France and Spain to be cemented by their union. Though much debated, this was never effected. New hopes were excited a few years later by the dangerous illness of the young Princess of Condé. "Many people said," writes Mademoiselle, that "if she should die, I might marry the prince. I dreamed on this. In the evening, walking in my chamber, I reasoned on it with Préfontaine, and found the matter was feasible, from the union which existed between Monsieur and the prince." But the Princess of Condé recovered, and marriage with her husband was not feasible. Another suitor was found in Charles the Second of England, who was then an exile at the French Court. He was ardent, Mademoiselle tells us, and his mother was eager. But Charles was a king

without a crown, and Mademoiselle and her family hesitated about devoting her great estates to the recovery of a lost kingdom. Of lords and dukes of less degree there were many who would have desired so great an alliance, but their pretensions were not considered sufficient by a would-be queen or empress. The marriage which seemed the most attractive of all was one with her cousin, Louis the Fourteenth. He was eleven years younger than she, but such an alliance might seem the best way to propitiate the Duke of Orleans and secure peace for the kingdom. It was hinted at by emissaries of the Court, but the matter did not go beyond hints.[1]

An opportunity now offered for Mademoiselle to please her vanity, by posing as a rival of Mme. de Longueville and the other heroines of the Fronde, and perhaps, also, fairly to bombard Louis into matrimony. The king's forces sought to obtain possession of the important city of Orleans, and it was necessary to send some one there to oppose their efforts. The Duke of Orleans did not wish to go; his daughter was eager to go, and she was accordingly sent to assume the command in his name. Though frivolous in her views, Mademoiselle was courageous, generous, and beside her father assumed almost the proportions of an heroic character. She was encouraged in her expedition by the friends of Condé. Mme. de Châtillon told her that she and the Duke of Nemours had talked for two hours on the day before about making her queen of France, and that she should not doubt that Condé would labor for this end with all his heart. Accordingly Mademoiselle mounted in her carriage with the countesses of Frontenac and Fiesque, whom the wits dubbed her *maréchales de camp*, and accompanied by a few soldiers, proceeded rapidly to Orleans. The gates were closed, and the officers of the king demanded entrance at one side of the city and Mademoiselle at the other.[2] A judicious use

[1] These various matrimonial plans are described in "Mémoires de Mlle. de Montpensier," and are frequently referred to in the diplomatic correspondence of the time.

[2] Talon, 473.

of money made her success easier.[1] The gates continued closed, but some of the boatmen plying on the Loire took her in their barges and rowed her to where the river passes under the city walls. An opening was knocked in some old passage over the river, and Mademoiselle scrambled up a ladder placed on two boats. One of the rounds was broken, and she found great difficulty in mounting the gap. But she says she counted nothing difficult which was advantageous to her party, and she reached the opening, was pushed through the hole by a valet, and at last, dirty but triumphant, she entered the city,

She received a hearty welcome from the officials and inhabitants, and installed herself at the Hotel de Ville as governor of the place. Her reception ended the efforts of the king's forces to gain admittance. Mademoiselle enjoyed discussing campaigns with the generals and politics with the aldermen, and her reputation as a heroine, which she had so suddenly gained. But perhaps no compliment pleased her more than that of the adroit courtiers, who insinuated that the new Joan of Arc had saved Orleans from its enemies, after first repelling the English in the shape of Charles II. She found, however, thorns in power. She desired to admit Condé into the city on his arrival from Guienne, but the burgesses objected to his reception. The aristocratic feelings of the princess were outraged by any doubts cast on the rightness of Condé's actions, and she declared that the intentions of the great should be like the mysteries of the faith; it did not belong to common people to penetrate them, but only to revere them and believe that they were always for the welfare and the safety of the state. She was tried also by the dissensions between Beaufort and Nemours. These belligerent brothers-in-law quarrelled and struck each other in her presence. She compelled them to surrender their swords to her, and Beaufort expressed his regret for his conduct and his sorrow for Nemours' unfounded hostility

[1] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 163. "Con denari e promessi guadagnarono li batteliere."

to him. Nemours, however, remained angry and impolite. In May, Orleans being now firm in the cause of the princes, Mademoiselle and her female lieutenants returned to Paris. On her way she visited Condé's army, was received with the honors due a victorious general, was shown a review, and the polite officers offered to fight a battle with the king's forces for her entertainment. She declined this spectacle and passed on to Paris.

In the meantime, Condé had assumed command of the army, and its movements were marked by new vigor. He found the Marshal of Hocquincourt encamped at Bleneau, while Turenne, who had been made general of the king's forces, was at a short distance. Condé resolved to lead the attack at once, and endeavored to defeat the two branches of the army separately. The assault on Hocquincourt was vigorous and successful. The royal forces were speedily routed. The camp equipage and provisions, 3,000 horses, a large number of soldiers, Hocquincourt's silver service, his jewels, and much of his money fell into the hands of the enemy. The king and the Court were at Gien, and the news of this defeat spread consternation and almost panic. It seemed for a few hours as if Condé was to become master of the kingdom by a single brilliant movement, but his triumph was brief. Turenne promptly led his troops to the assistance of the routed forces of Hocquincourt. Unwilling to encounter Condé's cavalry in the open field, he placed his army on a height, commanded by artillery, and strongly protected by a wood and some neighboring marshes. A sharp encounter at once began in the defile which led to the hill, and a pitched battle seemed imminent between the two greatest generals of France. But Condé was unwilling to risk the fortune of the war against a general like Turenne entrenched in a position of great strength. He fell back, and two or three days later he left the army and proceeded to

[1] Mémoires de Mademoiselle de Montpensier, 89–109. Dis. Ven., cxiv., 163, *et seq.*

Paris.[1] Napoleon criticises both leaders. Turenne, he says, should be blamed for opposing the whole army of the Fronde with a single division of the royal army, instead of waiting for reinforcements from Hocquincourt and Bouillon to have made him equal or superior in numbers. Condé, on the other hand, lacked in audacity, and fearing to attack Turenne when his forces were superior, lost the possibility of speedy victory for the certainty of slow defeat.

Chavigni and other of Condé's friends had desired that he should go at once to Paris. The importance of the victory at Bleneau was magnified in the city, and with these fresh laurels Condé believed that he could check the intrigues of Retz, overawe the friends of the government, arouse the enthusiasm of his own followers, and that Paris firm in his cause would carry the kingdom with it. In truth, few men were less fitted than Condé to deal with the caprices of a great city, and to gain either strength or glory by plots and counterplots. When he left his army for the capital, he found only disappointment, defeat, and disgrace. The burgesses were by no means desirous of receiving so turbulent and powerful a visitor, but it was stated that Condé came to Paris only to confer with Orleans for a little time, perhaps not over twenty-four hours. After that he would return to the army, and Orleans pledged his word that during this time there should be no disorder in Paris. Upon such conditions the city government disregarded the order of the king and consented to Condé's entry.[2] On April 11th he drove into the city, followed by fifty carriages filled with his friends and retainers, and scattering louis d'or among the pick-pockets and vagabonds, who lighted bonfires and filled themselves with bad liquor in honor of his arrival. The prince appeared in the Par-

[1] Rochefoucauld, 366–374. Gourville, 506, 507. Duke of York, 536, 537. Mémoires de Turenne, 435–436. Dis. Ven., cxiv., 173–5. Hocquincourt's jewels and money, which he had with him in camp, and which were captured, amounted to 400,000 francs.

[2] Registres de l'Hôtel de Ville, ii., 232–5. Journal du Temps Present, 254, *et seq.*

liament, but he was coldly received. President le Bailleul said that he wished he could have seen him in his place under other circumstances than the present, when a condemnation issued by the king and registered by the Parliament still hung over his head, and when his hands were red with the blood of loyal Frenchmen. These words excited a violent commotion among Condé's adherents, but an angry discussion was the nearest approach to welcome which the prince received.[1]

The feeling in Paris was very confused, and the practical unanimity which had been found there in the earlier stages of the Fronde had passed away. Some months before this, the change had been noticed by Retz, than whom no man knew better the ebb and flow of passion and feeling in the great capital. In January he wrote to Charrier: "As for Paris, I do not remark the warmth which there was formerly on such occasions. They cry out enough against Mazarin and the queen, but they do no more."[2] As the spring advanced there was much misery and discontent in the city, and a weariness of turmoil came over the citizens. Prices were high. In March one of Mazarin's correspondents wrote him from Paris, that misery was increasing every day from the dearness of provisions, and one saw such attenuation in the bodies of the poor that they seemed perishing in plain sight. Such a condition caused apprehension of the pest. Wheat, according to the writer, was already over two dollars a bushel and meat thirty cents a pound.[3] Some of the artisans declared they would rather see the king back, even though he brought Mazarin with him, than to be without work for themselves and bread for their families during disorders that had no end. Merchants and burgesses complained even more than the artisans. The members of the Parliament, they said, debated and prated and drew their wages, while mechanics were starv-

[1] Talon, 475–476. Dis.Ven., cxiv., 175, 176. Journal du Temps Present, 262, 263.

[2] Letter of Jan. 5, 1652.

[3] Aff. Etr. Fr., 889, pièce 64. Cited in Cheruel i., 147.

ing, while mercenary soldiers were cutting the green crops and burning the farm-houses about Paris, while manufactories were stopped, fairs were abandoned, no boat or pack train could go in safety, there was no money to pay workmen, and no market to sell goods. The number of the poor who demanded charity in Paris was very great, and a hundred thousand more were ashamed to ask, but were sorely in need.[1] Mazarin employed money freely in paying for the services of pamphleteers, who endeavored to stimulate returning loyalty. He directed Fouquet to advance 6,000 livres, to be used among the people or for publishing pamphlets. He sent money to be given to the clergy, that they might persuade their flocks.[2] The cry of "Vive Mazarin!" was heard in the streets by night, and some of the bourgeois said they would rather have twenty foreign cardinals than a day of battle in the streets of Paris.[3]

Amid all these disturbing elements, the members of the Parliament and the officers of the Hotel de Ville pursued a vacillating policy that made them equally odious to the king, the princes, and the populace. All were agreed that they wanted to be rid of Mazarin. Orleans and Condé declared that if Mazarin were sent away again they would ask no more, which was false. The judges and aldermen said that if the king would come back to his good city of Paris without Mazarin they would be contented, which was true. Assemblies of the different courts were again held at the Chamber of St. Louis, but they disputed about questions of precedence and dignity, and did little more than implore the king to send away the cardinal.[4]

Condé and Orleans were as uncertain in their course as were the counsellors of the Parliament and the colonels and aldermen of the Hotel de Ville. Mme. de Longueville in Guienne had continued to advise war; but when Condé reached Paris, he was subjected to influences that

[1] Talon, 483–490. Conrart, 550, 551.

[2] Lettres à Fouquet, Cipher Mss., Bib. Nat., 23,202., 29, 33, etc.

[3] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 199.

[4] A full account of these meetings is found in Talon, 470 *et seq.*

tended towards peace. His mistress, Mme. de Chatillon, was as beautiful as his sister, but less heroic.[1] Early married to one of the family of Admiral Coligny, she had been early left a widow. She had been the lady-love of the Duke of Nemours, and had now a strong hold on the affections of Condé. She was greedy for admiration and still more greedy for money. After seeing one lover killed and another exiled, she was to marry a German prince, and to die at seventy with the reputation of being almost the richest and altogether the meanest woman in France. Over this woman, who was as attractive and as unprincipled as any of the heroines of the Fronde, Mazarin secured an easy hold by offering her large bribes to induce Condé to make peace. She had an acute and a zealous assistant in the Duke of Rochefoucauld. Rochefoucauld was weary of war, and disappointed in ambition, and to this was now added a spiteful jealousy of the woman he had so long adored. Among the many misfortunes of the last few months in Guienne, Mme. de Longueville, whether justly or unjustly, had excited Rochefoucauld's jealousy and injured her own reputation. If she had not been constant to marital obligations, she had thus far been true to the laws of romance. But when Nemours went south he had relieved his military duties by devotion to Condé's sister. Whether she was weary of her sarcastic and despondent admirer, or for whatever reason, she gave much encouragement to Nemours, and Rochefoucauld came to Paris filled with pique and rage. "He told me," says Mme. de Motteville, "that from jealousy and vengeance he did whatever the Duchess of Chatillon wished."

With such negotiators terms of peace were proposed to the Court. It was provided by them that Mazarin should retire from the kingdom, but Condé seems to have been willing that there should be a tacit understanding that

[1] Condé showed his affection in the way she liked best, by giving her lands of which the rental was said to be ten thousand crowns a year (Muse historique of Loret). Mademoiselle said that the Bourbons gave so rarely, that when they gave at all they always gave wrong.

this retirement should only be temporary.[1] If personal advantages could be secured, he was ready to abandon the nominal pretext for the years of rebellion which had devastated half of France and caused as much misery in that kingdom as all of Richelieu's wars with foreign powers. Orleans and Condé were to be charged with the negotiations for peace with Spain. Orleans was to be satisfied in his demands and his friends were to have their desires gratified. Condé was to have the government of Provence, Nemours the government of Auvergne, Rochefoucauld a hundred and twenty thousand crowns to buy a government, and other friends and followers were to be rewarded with titles or money. Mme. de Chatillon, it is said, was to have a hundred thousand crowns for her services. Mazarin received and considered these propositions, but he had no thought of acceding to them.[2] All these intrigues made Orleans distrustful of Condé, the Parliament distrustful of both, and the people distrustful of all three.[3] The Parliament also carried on its own negotiations, but they resulted in nothing. Mazarin was a past master in diplomacy of this sort, and by it he gained time for himself and bred division among his enemies.

As they could not obtain the terms they wished, the princes desired that the Parliament and the Hotel de Ville should unite with them, and the city of Paris should thus be fully enlisted in their cause. The judges were willing to join in the demand for Mazarin's expulsion, but they were not willing to unite in the other requests of the princes. Unable to find the support among the better classes which the old Fronde had once possessed, Condé endeavored to enlist the populace in his cause. By an appeal to the lowest element in Paris, it was hoped that the courts and city council would be driven to his support. By inflaming the worst classes he would terrorize the better classes. When Condé and Orleans made their en-

[1] Morosini, who was well informed, wrote on May 28th : "Condé si e pero resoluto ad approvare la dimora del cardinal," t. cxiv., 212.

[2] Mss. Bib. Nat., 23,202. Mazarin à Fouquet, May 7th, also p. 209.

[3] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 188.

try into the city, a mob of five or six thousand vagabonds and blackguards gathered at the Pont Neuf insulting passers-by and reviling Mazarin. Even ladies in their carriages were compelled to stop until they should utter filthy passwords of abuse, and the favor of this disorderly element was cultivated.[1] "I am weary," said the prince, "of rendering an account of my actions to these little fellows, who when I make war, say I wish to take the crown from the king's head, and when I propose peace, call me a Mazarinite. I will reason no more with these knaves, but I will teach them to behave and show the respect that is my due." [2]

As Condé and the Duke of Beaufort came from the grand chamber on May 15th, they told the people that the Parliament was trifling with them and would resolve on nothing. The mob gathered and howled, Union! Union! and then rushed for one of the entrances to the court, and forced it open. The judges hastily passed a resolution, asking the king for a speedy answer to their request for Mazarin's dismissal, and escaped from the palace by other entrances.[3]

On the 4th of May Turenne had won a small victory at Étampes, and Condé was resolved to counteract the discouragement caused by this defeat. Saint Denis was near Paris, and scantily garrisoned, and an attack upon it offered an opportunity for an easy victory. On the morning of the 11th of May Condé rode through the streets crying out, "Let him who loves me follow me; let us go and beat the Mazarinites." He was soon leading a motley army of 20,000 ill-armed or unarmed men. Some gathered about the Hotel de Ville and demanded arms for the service of the princes, but they were told that no arms could be furnished except for the defence of the city. The wives of those who were married made so terrible an uproar at these preparations for battle, that many of the warriors stayed behind, ensuring peace at home and

[1] Talon, 474. Journal du Temps Present, 255, 256, etc.

[2] Conrart, 555.

[3] Registres de l'Hotel de Ville, ii., 321.

avoiding danger abroad. Leading a few thousand of these irregular troops, mostly shop-boys and cut-purses, together with about 1,500 regular soldiers, Condé proceeded to St. Denis. A few hundred Swiss mercenaries guarded the town and the abbey. Condé forced an entrance into the place after a short resistance, and reaching the abbey and monastery, demanded that the Swiss should surrender at once, or he would pillage and burn all that he found. Fagots were piled up against the great door of the church ready for lighting. The Swiss were in no condition to make a successful resistance, and the monks besought them to yield the punctilios of honor and save the property of the Lord. They accordingly surrendered.[1] On the morning of the next day, which was Sunday, Condé marched into Paris leading sixty Swiss prisoners two by two, with his citizen soldiery as triumphant as if they had come from Lens or Rocroi. A garrison had been left at St. Denis, but on the 12th Turenne sent the king's forces against the town, and by vespers the attack was begun. The place was retaken as easily as it had been captured. The monks who had been reviled as Mazarinites the day before, were now accused of being Frondeurs. A party of Condé's troops had taken refuge in the tower of the abbey. Their surrender was demanded, and the unhappy prior and under prior were roundly abused for not compelling it. Part of the abbey was set on fire and even the sanctuary of St. Denis, the apostle of the French, was profaned by the flames. The monk tells us that the person who ordered the fire to be lighted, perished a few weeks later by a violent death. Fighting went on in the abbey itself. Some were wounded in the cloisters, and one soldier was shot dead on the steps of the tomb of Francis I. Fifty

[1] The troops entered the monastery, and as the under prior appproached a party of them cried out, "There goes a Mazarinite," and he was glad to escape with sore shoulders and his cowl torn off his head. Condé, however, was courteous, and expressed no desire except for food. It was fast day, and all the monks could furnish him was fruit and two fresh eggs. The prince ate one with great appetite and gave the other to Rochefoucauld. —Chronique de l'Abbaye.

of Condé's soldiers climbed over the vaulting of the Chapel of the Valois and reaching the garden made their escape. Those who were left in the tower at last surrendered. The monks were much embarrassed in conscience by the question of whether the church must be reconsecrated after the sacrilege it had suffered. It was at last decided that a fresh consecration was not necessary. The monks returned to their pious labors, and the abbey again resounded only with matin song and vesper prayer. The bones of the kings were to rest in peace until the mob came a hundred and forty years later to tear them from their tombs.[1]

A new actor now appeared at Paris. The Duke of Lorraine had long been a duke without a duchy, and he lived as a princely highwayman, having under his command a small but well-disciplined army of mercenaries, whose services he sold to any party. He endeavored to draw pay from both sides, and to preserve his troops by allowing them to fight on neither side. His assistance was solicited by his brother-in-law, the Duke of Orleans, and by the Prince of Condé. He promised them his support, and at the same time suggested to Mazarin that he might furnish his army for the aid of the king.[2] In diplomatic deceit and the art of lying he was not inferior to the cardinal, and he marched his army into France holding out hopes and extending promises to all parties. If there was doubt as to his final object, it was clear that his immediate object was plunder. On the banners of his army, it was said, the legend ran, "Strike hard, take every thing, and yield nothing." The march of his troops was an unbroken course of robbery, arson, and murder.[3] His army consisted of twelve thousand men, accompanied by four thousand women and four thousand servants. Much of the territory through which they passed was already so

[1] Conrart, 551, 552. Registres de l'Hotel de Ville, 322–328. Livre des Choses Memorables de l'Abbaye de St. Denis, 336–394.

[2] In September, 1651, Mazarin wrote that Lorraine offered an alliance, and if they could not get Condé's good-will it had best be accepted.—Mss. Bib. Nat., 23,202., 16.

[3] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 227.

desolate, that only a soldier of Lorraine could glean any thing from it. In some places the people were reduced to living on bread made of bran, and on grass, snails, dogs, and cats.[1] Where the soldiers could find nothing to eat they at least found houses to burn, and they pillaged impartially the homes of the peasants and of the gentlemen. Some towns bought exemption by paying enormous fines. Where no money could be obtained the soldiers avenged themselves by destroying whatever they could find.

Early in June Lorraine reached Paris, and, leaving his army near the city, he himself entered the capital. He had a reputation for bravery; his manners were frank and jovial, and he became the hero of the day. But though he was greeted with much honor by the princes and the populace, the Parliament refused to receive an open enemy of the state. He found amusement during his stay by telling of the brutalities of his troops, how they had made soup of nuns, and there were among them a thousand men, any one of whom would undertake to murder Mazarin for an old silver piece. He was willing to make love to all the Amazons of the Fronde, though Mme. Montbazon pleased him most, being the equal of any in beauty, and excelling all in vice.

But while the duke would talk love he would not talk business. Étampes was besieged, and as the news came that it was hard pressed the princes endeavored to draw from him some plan of action. The only answer he would give was to sing and dance, to play on his guitar, and tell stories so broad, that they brought blushes even to the cheeks of the ladies of the Fronde. "If it was not known he was a very able man," says Mademoiselle, "one would take him for a fool.[2]

His army in the meantime was encamped near the village of Choisy, pillaging, and cutting the unripe hay and

[1] Archives des Aff. Etr., cited by Haussonville.

[2] Montpensier, 115. Conrart, 556. "Reunion de la Lorraine," etc., Haussonville, ii., 330, *et seq.* Talon, 488. The Venetian minister called Lorraine's conduct very bizarre, t. cxiv., 226.

wheat. The unhappy farmers dared not complain, because it was said that these were the soldiers who had come to chase away Mazarin. Their leader, however, had no thought of attempting such an undertaking. Through the diplomacy of Chateauneuf and Mme. de Chevreuse, the king finally made a treaty with Lorraine by which the duke agreed forthwith to retire from France.[1] In order to satisfy such lingering pretences of good faith as he made, it was agreed that the siege of Étampes should be raised. To relieve this city, the duke announced to his allies at Paris, had been the object of his expedition, and when this was accomplished he could retire with honor. He accordingly left Paris, though he would gladly have kept his troops for the present in free quarters in France. But the Marshal of Turenne would suffer no trifling from this freebooter. He led his forces from Étampes to Lorraine's camp, and informed him that he must prepare for battle or march forthwith on a route indicated, and be outside the borders of France within twelve days. Refusing to trust his word, Turenne demanded hostages for the performance of this agreement. Lorraine had no thought of risking his army in a battle against Turenne. The hostages were given, and within an hour his troops were under march.[2]

This desertion carried dismay among the followers of Condé and Orleans. Discouraged in their hopes of aid from Lorraine, the populace became still more violent against the delays and uncertainties of the city government and of the judges. If no help came from outside, it was the more important that Paris should be wholly in

[1] Letters of Fouquet and other documents, Aff. Etr. Fr., t. 883, published by Haussonville.

[2] Charles II., of England, who was then a fugitive at Paris, receiving from the French king a pension for his support, acted as mediator between the two generals. His brother, the Duke of York, who was himself to be dependent on Louis' bounty many years later, was then serving as a volunteer in Turenne's army. His finances were so low, that if a Gascon gentleman had not lent him three hundred pistoles, he could not have provided himself with the moderate equipments that were necessary for the service.—Turenne, 441, 442. Mém. de York, 535, 543–545.

the cause. If timid judges who had no thoughts beyond their fees, and sleek aldermen who cared only for their shops and their merchandise, would not do what the interests of the state demanded, it was time they were terrified into vigor and patriotism. Pamphlets were circulated as violent as those of later revolutions. "Let us spare neither great nor small, young nor old," said one; "Let us leave the holes we live in, barricade, kill, and sack, and sacrifice to a just vengeance whoever is not for liberty, and the true party of the king."

In the troubled condition of affairs the people had demanded that there should be a solemn procession to St. Genevieve, the patron saint of the town, to beseech her to aid in bringing peace and driving away Mazarin. The shrine of the saint was borne along in pious state. When it passed Condé he rushed to it, threw himself on his knees in the middle of the street, kissed a hundred times the holy relic, and retired amid the applause of the populace. "Ah! the good prince!" cried the fisherwomen and the boatmen, the cut-throats and the thieves. "See how pious he is."[1] Money as well as piety was used among the people. Their zeal was praised, their pockets were filled, their superstition was gratified. Thus prepared, they were incited to violence by open abuse of the judges and officials, who were held out as dead to the public weal, and as mere tools of Mazarin.

On the 18th of June a general assembly of all the city bodies, with representatives from the religious communities and the trade organizations, was held in the Chamber of St. Louis to consider measures for the relief of the poor. Little was done there except to discuss the great number of persons who, in the disturbed condition of

[1] Mme. de Motteville, 435. Registres de l' Hotel de Ville, ii., 364–377. This procession was on the 11th of June. The clergy of the church were required to furnish a breakfast for the city officers, and there was bitter complaint because they gave the provost and a few of his associates two loaves of bread and two bottles of wine, and gave the others nothing at all. The complaints of the hungry aldermen were entered in their official minutes. —Reg., p. 373.

trade and manufactures, needed aid from those who had any thing to give. On Friday the twenty-first, the chambers of Parliament were again assembled to discuss further the needs of the city and the citizens. The Duke of Orleans could not be present because, compelled either by his health or his timidity, he stayed home to be bled. An angry crowd of malcontents gathered around the palace, howling alternately "Peace!" and "No Mazarin!" Fearing a more serious disturbance the judges voted to adjourn to the twenty-fifth, but as they came from their chamber some of them were roughly handled, and one had his hat knocked off and his head punched.

On the same day the Duke of Beaufort returned from the army and endeavored to increase the irritation he found among the dregs of the population, to whom he was specially dear. Placards were posted on the corners of the streets asking the people to gather in the Place Royale, and there Beaufort went in the afternoon and harangued a mob of hired bravos and idle and restless artisans. He told them that the army of Mazarin was almost at their gates, but the Parliament and the Hotel de Ville were full of the cardinal's followers and would do nothing. They must have new colonels and captains, said the duke, and have money voted. He himself would give them a list of the houses of the Mazarinites which they could visit, and either compel the inhabitants to contribute for the good cause or drive them from Paris. If this were done, within three months they would have peace and plenty, and Mazarin would be wearing his red gown outside of the French boundaries. The mob shouted their approval and cried out that their lives and the rags on their backs were all at Beaufort's disposal. He bade them come to the palace early on the morning of the next day with their arms, to compel the Parliament to unite with the princes. That body, however, was warned of some such disturbance, and had already adjourned till the twenty-fifth; the city officials had chains fastened across the streets, and the train bands patrolled them to check any violence or plun-

der. Beaufort's conduct was ill received by the better element, and the popularity he once possessed was now found only among the lowest classes. "He has talked like a bandit, and not like a prince or a gentleman," said the president Novion. All this disturbance, said others, was only because Beaufort feared his associates would make a treaty without him, and he wanted forty thousand crowns for his lady-love, the Duchess of Montbazon.[1]

On the twenty-fifth the Parliament met again, with several companies of the city guards stationed in front of the palace to protect it from violence. The judges assembled at eight, but it was not until after a seven hours' session that they succeeded in reaching a vote. All parties agreed that renewed petitions should be sent to the king, but the judges wished to send the former deputies, while Orleans and Condé wished new men to be chosen. It was carried against the wish of the princes by a vote of 92 to 85. The crowd outside had already come to blows with the guards. Some shots had been fired, three or four killed, and a few wounded. As the counsellors and presidents came from the palace, the mob demanded of them what had been decided. The answers were not satisfactory, and many cried out that unless they resolved on union with the princes they would tear them to pieces. Some of the judges received only abuse, but others received blows as well. Le Coigneux was pursued and fired at, and he escaped only by finding refuge in a shop, discarding his gown, and appearing in disguise. Most of them passed through a running fire of maledictions accompanied by kicks and blows. Orleans was still in the grand chamber, and as he heard the tumult he started out and returned again more than ten times, turning a deaf ear to those who asked him to try to calm the mob. At last he was carried off in safety in his carriage. Some shots were fired, and some of the bourgeois were wounded while watching the commotion from their windows. "They will find out," said the rioters, "that firearms are more

[1] Conrart, 562–3. Talon, 491. Dis. Ven., cxiv., 240, *et seq.*

dangerous than their yard sticks." After this scene of violence the most of the judges refused to attend further sessions of the Parliament, for fear of injury to life and limb. A few violent Frondeurs still came to the palace and said that they required no guards, even if the Mazarinites stood in need of them. Broussel, who was a respectable tool for the extreme Frondeurs, declared that judges should want no guard but their own probity. But neither lawyers could be found to plead, nor a court to hear them, in the terror that prevailed.[1]

The army of the prince was now stationed at St. Cloud, burning houses, destroying gardens, and giving much offence to the Parisians who owned country places in the environs.[2] The royal army had marched to St. Denis, and from there it was expected to cross the Seine and attack the prince at St. Cloud. To prevent this he resolved to lead his forces to Charenton, and he broke camp during the night of the 1st of July. By four on the morning of the second, his forces were under way, and they marched around the outside of Paris, from the gate of St. Honoré to that of St. Antoine, where they reached the direct road to Charenton. Turenne had at once moved in pursuit, and after some skirmishing near the gate of St. Martin, by nine in the morning he came up with Condé at the Faubourg St. Antoine, which lay south of the Bastille. Turenne was superior in numbers, but an additional force would soon have reached him under La Ferté Seneterre, and he would then have had an overwhelming advantage. Mazarin and the king's advisers were, however, eager for an immediate attack. It was not believed that Paris would open its gates to admit Condé's forces. Deprived thus of any opportunity for retreat, they could be driven to the walls and exterminated, and the war ended by one battle. Bouillon advised his brother to attack at once, lest his prudence should be interpreted as faintheartedness for the cause in which he had so recently en-

[1] Conrart, 563–5. Suite du Journal du Parlement, 1652, 1–23. Talon, 492, 493. [2] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 248. "Giardini ch' erano la delizia di Parigi."

listed. Condé fell back into the Faubourg St. Antoine, and the battle raged fiercely. He found there, however, the means for a vigorous defence. Chains and barricades had been placed in many of the streets to protect them from attacks by Lorraine's soldiers, and behind these Condé's troops made a stout resistance. The streets were narrow and cut up by ditches and deep ruts, which made it difficult for cavalry and even for foot soldiers to pass over them. The houses were filled with soldiers, and an irregular but murderous fire was poured from the windows and the roofs. In such a field of battle both sides displayed a reckless bravery. The officers led their troops amid firing in front and from either side, and the number of them killed was out of all proportion to the importance of the engagement, or the total number of the slain.

The Marquis of St. Megrin had for years borne a special hatred against Condé. He had cherished a strong and unfortunate love for Mlle. du Vigean, who in turn entertained a hopeless affection for the Prince of Condé and refusing all other lovers, had abandoned the world in the freshness of her youth to dream of him amid her prayers in the monastery of the Carmelites.[1] St. Megrin resolved to reach Condé, and by killing him avenge his lost love and end the war. Passing through the soldiers, he rode with a company of light cavalry down a narrow street, and charged on the barricade at the end. As he was pressing the attack, he was shot dead on the spot. There was mortally wounded with him, one before whom a great career seemed to be open. The young Mancini was the only nephew of Mazarin in France, and was destined to be the inheritor of the cardinal's enormous wealth. Many princes of the blood would have been glad

[1] The poets sang of this loss to the court:

"Lorsque Vigean quitta la cour,
Les jeux, les graces, les amours,
Entrèrent dans le monastère.
Les jeux pleurèrent ce jour-là ;
Ce jour la Beauté se voila,
Et fit vœu d' être solitaire."

See also Mém. de Conrart, 567.

to exchange lots with the heir of the chief minister of France, and the richest man in the kingdom. He was but sixteen, brave, handsome, and of great promise. As he was gallantly leading his soldiers, he was struck by a bullet, and died of his wounds a few days later.[1]

Condé's followers attacked the enemy with equal valor. Beaufort, Nemours, and Rochefoucauld charged down a street amid firing from the soldiers behind the piles of stones and in the houses, and captured and held a barricade almost without support. In this reckless and useless assault Nemours received thirteen wounds, and Rochefoucauld, struck in the cheek by a bullet which passed under both eyes, fell blinded and was carried away from the fight.[2] Condé acquitted himself with the skill of a general, and the desperate valor of a reckless soldier, in this hand-to-hand contest. One after another his nearest friends were shot down and carried away dead, or dangerously wounded. At last the troops led by La Ferté Seneterre came up and joined Turenne. Against fresh soldiers and a great preponderance in numbers neither skill nor valor could longer avail. Condé's soldiers were exhausted by their march and by a close conflict of five hours, waged in the intense heat. Many of their officers were killed or disabled, and they could fight only with the recklessness that comes from want of command. The gates of the city were still closed against the hard-pressed and overpowered troops, and the destruction of Condé's army seemed imminent.

But in the hour of their sore need a safe retreat was at last opened to them. No union with the princes had as yet been voted by the Parliament or the Hotel de Ville, and the city of Paris, therefore, standing neutral between

[1] Party hatred did not spare even the young and the innocent. In the pamphlets of the day, we find one that tells of the meeting of St. Megrin and Mancini in the world below, and of the apartments prepared in hell for Mazarin and his family.

[2] The Venetian minister sent off his dispatch while the fighting was going on, and wrote that Rochefoucauld had just been brought in wounded, and there was little probability of his living.

them and the king, had refused entrance to the forces of either side. If Orleans had ordered the gates to be thrown open for the retreat of Condé's army he would have been obeyed, but, as the danger became greater, Orleans grew more timid. His greatest anxiety had been lest Condé should station his army in the Faubourg St. Germain. A conflict there, Orleans could see from his own windows, and the artillery of the king could throw balls into the palace of the Luxembourg. On the day of the battle he walked about his palace, uncertain as to his course, alarmed by the firing, afraid to relieve Condé, afraid to leave him unrelieved, and whistling every tune ever heard in the Place Royale.

His daughter resolved to move him from his lethargy. Her laurels were fresh, and she wished to be the maid of Paris as well as of Orleans. Sympathy for the prince and his soldiers, in their distress, had also its effect upon the heroine, who, though often foolish, was always good-hearted. Admission had been given to the wounded soldiers, and the constant succession of these during the day, in every condition of pain and mutilation, had excited her compassion as well as that of many of the citizens. She met Rochefoucauld, who was covered with blood, and unable to see, but still endeavoring in his misery to excite the citizens to the relief of the prince. By her resolution she obtained from her father an order to the magistrates, that they might treat her as his representative and follow her directions. Thus fortified, she proceeded to the Hotel de Ville, followed by a few of her attendant Amazons. She demanded of the city fathers that troops should be sent for the protection of the Faubourg St. Antoine, and that they should order the gates to be opened for Condé's troops. The king had written with his own hand warning them against allowing these soldiers to enter. But armed with her father's authority, and with the influence of her own enthusiasm and courage, she obtained what she desired. She had accompanied her prayers with threats, that if they were not

heard, she would order her soldiers to take L'Hopital and the provost of the merchants and throw them out of the window. Troops were sent to the Faubourg and orders given that the wounded should be received into the city, and if Condé's troops were hard pressed the gates should be thrown open for their retreat.

From the Hotel de Ville, Mademoiselle went to the Bastille. Watching from there the battle raging in the narrow streets, she ordered the governor to turn his cannon upon the enemy. Mazarin and the king were stationed upon the heights of Charonne, from which they could overlook the entire combat, and hoped to see the destruction or capture of Condé's army. As they stood there a puff of smoke came from the Bastille, and cannon-balls were fired into the king's forces. They did little damage, but they showed that Paris had at last declared for Condé, and that his army was safe. Wearied and hard pressed, Condé's troops saw the gates opened for their retreat, and they found safety within the walls of Paris. They had lost about a thousand killed, and Turenne's loss had been nearly the same.[1]

The battle might be regarded as a drawn one, with the advantage for Condé that, as a result of it, his troops had been received into Paris and he could now control the city. But this advantage was only apparent. He could ill afford to lose the soldiers that had fallen, and the loss among the officers and nobles who had been earnest in his cause was still more serious. The possession of Paris by an unruly soldiery was soon to lead to the most fatal

[1] For accounts of the battle of the Faubourg St. Antoine, see Rochefoucauld, 397–415. Mademoiselle, 118–125. Conrart, 565–567. Turenne, 443, 444. Duke of York, 545–550. Reg. de l'Hotel de Ville, iii., 39–47. Chronique de l'Abbaye de St. Denis, 416–419. Mém. du Prince de Tarente and Relation de Marigny. Motteville, 436–439. Dis. Ven., cxiv., 249–252. Morosini says if Turenne had been willing to do his duty, and press the attack as Mazarin desired, he could have destroyed Condé's army. The Duke of Orleans signed an order, directing the officers of the Bastille to fire on the army of the king and assist the troops of Condé. Mss. Bib. Nat., Fonds Baluze. But it was undoubtedly signed at his daughter's request, and so does not materially alter the correctness of her account.

event in the history of the Fronde, and the battle of the Faubourg of St. Antoine was one of the last efforts of the nobles in opposition to the royal authority. It left them exhausted, disheartened, struggling against a final defeat, that had now become certain. Though Condé's army had been received into Paris, the sight of some of the soldiers that composed it filled many of the citizens with shame and distress. There were seen in the capital of France soldiers carrying the cross of Burgundy and the red scarf of Spain, and it seemed as if Paris, by its own choice, had fallen into the hands of the Spanish. These bodies of troops added to the agitation which already existed in the city, and, countenanced by their leaders, they excited the massacre which appalled the Parisians and destroyed the Fronde.

CHAPTER XV.

THE CLOSE OF THE FRONDE.

THE Parliament was unwilling and afraid to take any further part in the confusion that existed, but it called a general assembly to advise on the measures necessary for the welfare and safety of the city. This met on July 4th, at the Hotel de Ville. The city officers, some of the clergy, many members of the Parliament, and delegates chosen from the various parishes were in attendance, in all to the number of three hundred and ten. From them the princes desired to obtain a resolution for the union of the city with themselves, in the war they were waging against the king. The majority of the delegates were friendly to their cause, and had Orleans and Condé attended the meeting and asked for such a resolution, it probably would have been adopted. They were apparently too indifferent to do this, and preferred to leave it to the ruffians among their adherents to frighten the burgesses into coöperation.

The assembly met in the afternoon, and waited for the arrival of the princes. All the approaches to the Hotel de Ville were filled with a dense crowd of the lowest elements of the city, who threatened the passing delegates, unless they decided on the measures that were required. A message arrived from the king forbidding the assembly, but it was received by a din of hooting and hissing. Some hours had passed since messengers had gone for Orleans, and as no answer came from him, the members resolved to consider what had best be done. The procureur-general addressed them, and ended by offering a resolution that the king should be asked to grant peace to his

subjects, and return again to his city of Paris. An uproar at once began, because in these resolutions there was nothing said against Mazarin. The officer replied that his whole speech had been directed against the cardinal, but that there might be no uncertainty, his resolution should request the king to return without Mazarin.

It was now nearly six, and at last Orleans, Condé, Beaufort, and a few other nobles made their appearance. In order to distinguish themselves from the Mazarinites, the adherents of the princes had lately chosen the device of a wisp of straw. This was carried not only by the men, but by women and children. Even the horses and donkeys were decorated with straw as they dragged their loads through the streets. The princes and their followers now had their hats liberally adorned with straw, and waved this emblem as they passed through the crowd. They took their seats, and the proceedings of the assembly were read to them. They asked for no further resolution, and as it was now past six, they at once left the Hotel de Ville. As they passed through the mob outside, they threw some pieces of money, and said that nothing had been decided and the place was filled with Mazarinites.

It needed no more to excite the ruffians and thieves who now blocked every entrance to the Hotel de Ville. Hardly had the princes driven away, when some shots were fired and bullets began to strike the windows of the hall of the assembly. These did little damage, but the soldiers among the mob taught them the rules of warfare.[1] Ascending the buildings around the square, they began a raking fire into the hall, from above or on the same level. The delegates threw themselves on the floor, or hid in different parts of the building. It was hoped that the mob might be conciliated by the action which had been desired, and a resolution for a union with the princes was hurriedly passed. A paper containing the resolution was thrown from the windows, and the priests displayed the

[1] The Venetian Ambassador says there were some two hundred officers of Condé's among the mob, disguised as boatmen.

sacrament, but neither had any effect upon the populace. Miron, of the Chamber of Accounts, went out to persuade them that the assembly had done all that was wanted, but he was murdered in the Place de Grève. Some of the delegates succeeded in making their escape by different ways and in various disguises. Many of the rioters only desired plunder, and for liberal pay they conducted some of the magistrates safely home. Others were butchered as they tried to escape, and the most of them remained in the Hotel de Ville, afraid to make any attempt to leave it.

The entrances to the building were guarded, and only a few of the rioters succeeded in entering. But in the meantime it had been fired in several places. It burned very slowly, but the smoke and heat added to the terror of the scene. Pitch had been piled up against the doors and oil poured over this, in order to start a sufficient fire to destroy so massive a building. It was soon filled with a dense smoke, and this was accompanied by a terrible smell. As the fire made an opening at the great door, one of Condé's officers, with about thirty followers, rushed in to mount the grand staircase. But they were repulsed, and many of them killed. It was feared, however, that by the fire all the doors would soon be opened to the mob. Some of the rioters now forced an entrance. They murdered a few of those they found, but their chief desire was plunder. The delegates barricaded various rooms with furniture, in order to make such defence as was possible, confessed themselves to the priests, and prepared for death. The governor of the city and the provost of the merchants were known to be friendly to the government, and they were specially odious to the followers of Condé. The governor succeeded in escaping in the disguise of a valet through a crowd clamoring for his death, but the provost remained concealed at the Hotel de Ville. It was now eleven at night. The shooting and occasional murders had proceeded leisurely for five hours. The heat within the building was terrible, and its inmates were in danger of soon being burned to death. The re-

ports of this butchery had been carried to the princes, and they were told that as many of their adherents as of their opponents were being murdered. They declined, however, to take any steps to check it. Condé said, laughingly, that he was a poltroon in seditions of this sort. Orleans was always a coward, and he dared not expose himself. But Beaufort was said to be in a shop near the scene of the slaughter, and it was at last decided that he had best make some endeavor to stop it. Mademoiselle was always brave and kindly, and she drove in her carriage towards the Hotel de Ville to use her influence in quieting the rioters. It was towards midnight when Beaufort arrived. Mademoiselle came somewhat later. Beaufort had little trouble in dispersing the mob. Some cried out: "It would be better to roast the Mazarinites," but they were quieted. Those who still remained in the building were enabled to make their retreat in safety. The provost of merchants resigned his office into Mademoiselle's hands, and was escorted safely to his home.

By two o'clock order was restored, and all those who were in danger had made their escape. Attention was now turned to saving the building from destruction by fire. The massive stones of which it was built had made the progress of the flames very slow. The people worked incessantly with the poor supplies of water, which could be obtained for conflagrations at that time. By nine the next morning the fire was entirely extinguished. It had done some damage, but the main portion of the building, which was historically the most interesting in Paris, and among the most beautiful, escaped destruction. By a curious fate, the Hotel de Ville, so peculiarly connected with the history and traditions of the city of Paris, was burned in 1871 by Frenchmen and Parisians, similar in character to the mob of 1652.[1]

About thirty of the delegates had been killed or wounded, and as many as one hundred and fifty others

[1] Registres de l'Hotel de Ville, iii., 51–75. Dis. Ven., cxiv., 253, *et seq.* Mém. de Montpensier, 125–128. Talon, 494–496. Conrart, 567–574.

were said to have been killed. Condé had not designed this series of brutal murders, but he had deemed it expedient to terrorize the city officials. The attack had been conducted by his soldiers, and he had been criminally remiss in any attempt to check the slaughter.[1] Little effort was made to punish the perpetrators of these crimes. Two were arrested and executed, one of whom was one of Condé's cooks. No one dared to make any searching investigation into the matter, and the ruffians who had allowed some deputies to escape on taking what money they had and receiving the promise of more, visited their victims and demanded the remainder of the ransom.

It had been intended to terrify the city into submission, and this massacre produced the desired result. No one questioned further any wish of the princes. Many of the Parliament and city officials fled from Paris. Meetings were called of those who remained, and they adopted without debate any propositions that were submitted. Broussel was unanimously chosen provost of the merchants, and this ancient imbecile closed his career by accepting a vacancy compelled by arson and murder. He took his oath of office before the Duke of Orleans, instead of the king.[2]

But of all Condé's mistakes the most fatal one was his belief that by terror and violence he could compel Paris to render him assistance that would be of value. The massacre was the death-blow to his party. He was regarded by all as responsible for scenes, which were declared to be the most brutal that Paris had ever witnessed. All except the refuse of the population were filled with loathing for political parties, who sought their ends by

[1] Conrart says that as Condé and Orleans drove away from the Hotel de Ville they said: "Ce sont des Mazarins, faites ce que vous voudrez." The registers of the Hotel de Ville say the princes gave money to some, and said the Hotel de Ville was full of Mazarinites, "et q'il falloit mettre main basse." Morosini states their language in almost the same words. Rochefoucauld, Condé's friend and companion, says the prince was unjustly accused of planning the massacre, but that he had wished to frighten those who were not in his interest.—Mém., 417–419.

[2] Registres de l'Hotel de Ville, iii., 76–85.

such violence. Paris had long begun to weary of these civil wars, which caused disaster and were productive of no good, and in which the prejudices of the people against an unpopular minister had been used to advance the greedy plans of ambitious leaders, who had always been ready to desert their supporters, and who had now begun to murder them.[1]

While the feeling of aversion to insurrection was growing stronger, it was resolved to yield again to the prejudice against Mazarin. The deputies of the Parliament were informed by Louis that so soon as the necessary orders had been given for the restoration of quiet in the kingdom, the cardinal would retire from the ministry. Such a promise was agreeable to the city of Paris, but not to the princes. They did not wish a peace based upon Mazarin's retirement, unless that was accompanied by the personal advantages which they demanded. The declaration was therefore criticised as evasive and given in bad faith, and it was demanded that the Duke of Orleans should be invested with an authority such as was required by the difficulties of the situation. In conformity with this request, the Parliament of Paris, on July 20th, declared that the king was held in captivity by Cardinal Mazarin, and the Duke of Orleans was chosen lieutenant-general of the kingdom so long as that minister continued in France. Condé was made general-in-chief of the army, and it was decided to send no more deputies to treat for peace while Mazarin remained in France.[2] The coöperation of the other Parliaments was asked, but none, except that of Bordeaux, were willing to approve of so revolutionary a measure. The fiction of the king's captivity under Mazarin had become ridiculous. Louis had attained his majority. He commanded armies of thousands of men, and the only captivity he suffered was that he desired to have the cardinal for his adviser. For a Parisian court to assume to choose a lieutenant-general who should act against the king, and a general-in-chief who

[1] Talon, 495, 496. Montpensier, 128. Joly, 76, etc.

[2] Journal du Parlement, July 20th. Talon, 497–501.

CONDÉ.

should lead armies against those of the sovereign, was a revolutionary act, and could only be justified by a popular demand for the overthrow of the royal authority. No such desire existed. Condé was gratified at being enabled to exercise a despotic control in Paris, but while he compelled the authorities to pass resolutions to his taste, popular support deserted him, and he was soon driven from the city without the firing of a gun.

The Parliaments of Rouen and Toulouse protested against this act of the Parliament of Paris. The other judicial bodies treated it with indifference. Orleans issued a proclamation declaring his assumption of the office of lieutenant-general of the kingdom, but, except in Paris, no one recognized his authority. He proceeded, however, to appoint a council of state to act as his advisers. Condé, Rochefoucauld, Beaufort, Chavigni, and some other noblemen, with various members of the courts and of the city government, composed this body, whose duties were to regulate all the affairs of the kingdom, but whose existence was very brief. The quarrels between some members of the council had a tragic end. Though the Dukes of Beaufort and Nemours were brothers-in-law, they had long been unfriendly, and their animosity increased with time. The quarrel had arisen from some question of precedence, and Nemours now insisted on a duel. As they reached the grounds back of the Hotel of Vendôme, Beaufort tried to remonstrate against the scandal of a duel between those so closely allied. Nemours was implacable, fired his pistol, and missed. He then advanced with his sword and Beaufort shot him dead. Eight seconds took part in the duel, of whom two were killed and one severely wounded. None of them had any controversy, but they fought with the fury required by the fashion of the time. Nemours was but twenty-eight. He was brave, witty, quarrelsome, and licentious, and was a fair type of the great noblemen who were leaders in the civil wars of the Fronde.[1]

[1] Dis. Ven., cxv., 10. Montpensier, 128–130. Marigny à Lenet, Mss. Lenet, 7156; *ib.*, 8409.

Money was needed to pay the troops which had been enlisted by the princes. At Orleans' request the authorities of the Hotel de Ville ordered a tax of 800,000 livres to be imposed on the city of Paris to defray these expenses, and also to pay the 150,000 livres which was still offered for the head of Mazarin. Each house having a porte cochère was to pay 75 livres or 150 francs, the shops paid 60 francs, and the small houses 30. But though it was easy to impose the tax, it was found impossible to collect it. The people were in no humor to pay considerable sums of money, under an illegal assessment, to carry on war against the king. The armies of Condé and Orleans had been reduced by the engagements of the spring and summer, and they lost still more by desertions from want of pay. They had numbered as many as twelve thousand men, but by August they were reduced to two or three thousand.[1]

The advisers of the king resolved to establish an opposition to the Parliament of Paris, that the king might have a friendly organization which would have the weight of that great name. A royal declaration required the members of the Parliament to meet at Pontoise, where Louis then was. It was not supposed that the body as a whole would regard this order. Its members claimed that the king had no power to order their sessions to be held out of Paris, and they avoided any discussion by resolving that the letters-patent directing the transfer should not be read while Mazarin remained in the kingdom. But some of those who were zealous in the royal service obeyed the call, and about thirty judges gathered at Pontoise and formed what the king recognized as the legal Parliament of Paris. Their zeal was not unrewarded, for pensions of 6,000 livres were afterwards granted to all those who had acted as members of the court at Pontoise. By their brethren at Paris they were regarded as a pope regards an anti-pope. A resolution

[1] Registres Hotel de Ville, iii., 122–127. Mémoires du Père Berthod, 582. Dis. Ven., cxv., 8. Aff. Etr. Fr., 883, pp. 24, 5, 9.

declared that unless the absent members within eight days returned to their places, they should forfeit their offices, and they and their posterity should for ever be incapable of holding any position in the Parliament.[1]

Unaffected by this violent and foolish action, the court at Pontoise proceeded with the part which had been assigned to it. Mazarin had resolved for the second time to leave France. Many had claimed that his return in January had been premature, and had given fresh vigor to Condé's failing rebellion. He himself had occasionally felt that more time should have been given, to allow the animosity against him to exhaust itself. It was now plain that the feeling which had so long sustained the commotions of the Fronde was giving way to a desire for peace, and for the restoration of orderly authority. The leaders in the rebellion against the king still made the demand for Mazarin's exile the pretext for their conduct, and if they were deprived of this, they would lose still more of the public support which was so fast deserting them.

The Parliament at Pontoise accordingly presented its petition, asking the king to restore tranquillity to his people by sending Mazarin from France. The cardinal seconded this petition, and asked that he might be allowed to retire. But Mazarin's second retirement from office was very different from his first. Then he had fled before a combination of his enemies, leaving the queen practically a captive, with the Parliaments all over France fulminating edicts against him, and with a large portion of the population both hoping and believing that he would never again resume the position from which he had been driven. The regent had been obliged to declare that she would never recall him, and to issue proclamations accusing him of inefficiency and crime. When he left the kingdom for the second time, Orleans and Condé were in open rebellion and Paris was in the possession of the insurgents. But the change in public sentiment during a year

[1] Journal du Parlement, 1652, 87–126. Talon, 505. Dis. Ven., cxv., 16–22.

and a half allowed the king to adopt a very different tone in reference to the minister. A manifesto recited his services, and the unjust and extraordinary assaults to which he had been exposed by those who were now in league with Spain. But that entire tranquillity might be restored, the king acceded to the petition of his Parliament and the repeated requests of Mazarin himself, and allowed the faithful minister to retire from office.[1]

No one believed that this retirement would be long continued, but it was, however, a very judicious measure. It embarrassed the princes engaged in a failing cause, and it quieted those ready to cease their resistance to the royal authority. On the 19th of August Mazarin left Pontoise, escorted by a large body of cavalry. He went to Sedan and from there to Bouillon, where he remained for some time. His departure was greeted with general applause, and it increased the desire for peace that was daily becoming stronger.[2]

Neither Condé nor Orleans intended to dismiss their soldiers and cease their revolt, merely because Mazarin had left the country, but they endeavored to propitiate public opinion by an answer to this measure. They declared that if the king would retire his troops from about Paris and from Guienne, would grant a full amnesty and restore all things to their condition before these troubles, and would allow a safe retreat to the foreign soldiers whom the princes had brought into the heart of France, they would then lay down their arms.[3]

There was no thought of granting any such extraordinary conditions. The princes asked for passports that they might send deputies to treat for terms of peace, but they were informed that passports would be furnished when they had laid down their arms and renounced their alliance with Spain. Mazarin's retirement, they had declared, had been the object for which they had taken up arms, and now that that had been accomplished, there

[1] Journal du Parlement, 1652, 108–113. [2] Dis. Ven., cxv., 26.
[3] Registres de l'Hotel de Ville, iii., 223–7.

was no need of deputies to treat of terms. They had now only to conduct themselves as obedient subjects of the king.[1]

On August 26th an edict of amnesty was issued. During five years, this said, France had enjoyed great prosperity, and her armies had everywhere been successful. Then internal discords had arisen, and for three years they had so hampered the resources of the state, that adversity had succeeded to prosperity. Those who sought advantage in turmoil had declared the Cardinal Mazarin to be the cause of these misfortunes, and in 1651 he had retired from the ministry. An edict against his return had been registered at the king's majority, but immediately after that Condé and his adherents had again begun a civil war, and had leagued themselves with Spain. Yet if all those who were now in rebellion would, within three days, lay down their arms and would send from the kingdom the foreign troops they had brought into it, a full amnesty would be granted. As a part of this act of grace, however, the king declared that all edicts of the Parliament should be annulled which had been passed since February 1, 1651, and had any reference to these internal troubles.[2] The various declarations against Mazarin were thus swept away, together with the other acts of eighteen months of turbulence and civil war.

The French kings claimed and exercised the right to annul, by their own will, the edicts registered or adopted by the courts. Those which the king had granted, he could revoke, and many of the measures, which had been adopted by the Parliament alone, were in the exercise of a political jurisdiction resting neither on tradition nor statute. The present act of the king was no more arbitrary than the acts of his ancestors, whenever they were powerful enough to be arbitrary, and it was regarded as a legitimate exercise of the royal authority. The Parliament of Paris

[1] Journal du Parlement, 130–142. This course was advised by Chateauneuf, Mazarin à Tellier, Aug. 20th, Mss. Bib. Nat., 4211.

[2] Journal du Parlement, 142–152.

was gratified by Mazarin's retreat, and showed no resentment at an attempt to sweep away so much that it had enacted.

The forces raised by Condé and Orleans had been much diminished, but they now received liberal reinforcements from their foreign allies. An army of twelve thousand men, composed partly of Spanish troops and partly of the soldiers of Lorraine, advanced through northern France and camped near Paris. Mazarin hoped to obtain Lorraine's aid for the king, and he complained of the duke's perfidy when he advanced into France.[1] The cardinal had promised Lorraine to obtain for him permission to make a plundering excursion into France, but he advised the council not to grant it. The duke in turn promised Mazarin that he would ally himself with the king, but had allied himself with the king's enemies.[2]

Turenne had only about eight thousand men, and he could not repel considerably larger forces. He succeeded, however, in checking them somewhat and in avoiding a battle. The allies might, perhaps, have crushed Turenne's army, but Condé was engaged in negotiating with the king, and he finally became sick and had to leave the field. Lorraine never wished to expose his troops to the risk of battle, and the Spanish archduke preferred keeping the most of his army to assist in the siege of Dunkirk and the other places which he was rapidly capturing. The armies remained for some weeks near Paris, and the devastations they committed alienated still more the former supporters of the princes. Until the leaders of the Fronde had brought the soldiers of Lorraine and of the archduke to their assistance, Paris and its environs had escaped the ravages of the wars with Germany and Spain. The country about Paris was rich and fertile and it offered an inviting field for the plunderers. It was now pillaged for the second time in this year. The zeal of the burgesses

[1] Mazarin à Tellier, Sept. 9th, Mss. Bib. Nat., 4211.

[2] These negotiations appear in the letters of Mazarin and Le Tellier for the latter part of August and early part of September, Mss., 4211, 4212.

and peasants to drive away Mazarin grew faint, when their villas were burned and their crops cut down by mercenaries who claimed they had come to Paris on that errand.

In the meantime the endeavors were continued to prepare the way for the king's return to Paris. Negotiations were carried on in behalf of all those who were still engaged in hostilities, but more attention was given to the people than the princes. It had long been attempted to build up a party in the city, which should be active in the royal service, and free from any alliance with the old or the new Frondeurs. The progress of events, and the evils produced by civil wars waged without justification, were most efficacious instruments in changing the tone of public feeling at Paris. But much was also done by Mazarin's agents, who, in various secret and complicated ways, endeavored to wean the public mind from judges like Broussel, priests like Retz, and generals like Condé. Much of this work was done by the clergy, who were Mazarin's favorite instruments for such intrigues. Money was used in some quarters and persuasion in others. It is doubtful whether these agents accomplished by their labors as much as they thought they did.[1] But the Fronde was near its end, and when the public feeling inclined towards a restoration of tranquillity, they assisted in directing it.

Retz saw that the times had changed, and he endeavored to put himself at the head of a popular movement for the return of the king. The clergy sent a delegation to assist in restoring peace and Retz acted as their spokesman. On September 11th he made a formal address, and he also had private interviews with the queen and with Le Tellier. He claimed that if the Parliament could be restored

[1] Accounts of these intrigues can be found in the memoirs of Père Berthod and the Mss. letters of the Abbé Fouquet and others to Mazarin in 1652. These accounts are usually interesting, and often valuable, but I think they should be read with caution. Such agents exaggerate the sentiments which they desire to find. Fouquet's letters are the most trustworthy, and he was a man of much ability in intrigue.

to Paris and public sentiment gratified in that respect, he could make peace in eight days, and Mazarin could return in eight more. Orleans was ready to make terms, and if Condé refused, he could be forced to leave Paris. Retz talked much of his own skill in the management of the public, and of the great influence he possessed in that city. But the ministers of the king distrusted his fidelity, and justly believed that his influence had much diminished. He was treated with courtesy, but he was unable either to represent the king, or to lead the people, in the movement now taking place.[1]

Many other veteran intriguers engaged in the endeavors to restore tranquillity. It was felt that those who at this time found themselves in office and favor might expect a long continuance, and that those who were ill viewed at the Court now would have little reason to anticipate any change for the better. Chateauneuf and Chavigni took an active part, but they gained nothing for themselves or their friends. Chavigni professed to represent Condé, of whom he had been an able and zealous follower. But a letter of his was intercepted in which he seemed to show a willingness to abandon the interests of his patron. Condé's violent temper was excited, and he reproached Chavigni with unbounded virulence and ferocity. This, and other mortifications, affected a constitution which may have been already impaired, and he died a few days after his interview with the prince.[2]

Condé was little troubled by seeing that the burgesses and shop-keepers were becoming weary of him. He was unfitted to deal with them, and was perhaps glad to be relieved from this necessity, even at the cost of losing Paris. But he believed that, with the aid of the Spanish, he should still be considerably superior in military strength to the armies of the king, and he demanded exorbitant

[1] Tellier à Mazarin, Sept. 14th. Mss. Bib. Nat., 4212., 76–79. An entertaining, but not entirely accurate account of his mission, is given by Retz himself, iv., 77–101.

[2] He was only forty-four, and he had eighteen children. Lettres à Lenet, Oct. 11th.

terms of peace.[1] Marchin must be made a marshal for betraying Catalonia to the Spanish, and Daugnon a marshal for trying to betray La Rochelle. Condé himself wished to have troops under his independent command, to remain for a while the ally of Spain, and ultimately to be charged with making peace with that country. Though such conditions were absurd, Mazarin thought it might be best to grant reasonable terms. The king could not contend against so powerful enemies as Spain, Lorraine, and Condé, and if an accommodation with the prince could be made, the minister advised such a measure.[2]

But he was dissuaded by some of his assistants. Servien had been reconciled with Mazarin and was again in office. He protested against the policy of giving rewards for insubordination and treason. Condé, he said, was only acting in bad faith and to gain time, and it was useless to endeavor to make terms with one so violent, false, and ambitious.[3] Paris was weary of war and irritated against the princes. It desired only the advantages that would come from the presence of its sovereign.[4] Twice he had returned to the capital of his kingdom after treaties and concessions, but only to find new turbulence. It was now time that the king should return, not as the result of negotiations, but freely and without conditions, recalled by the desire of the people.

The action of the king in refusing to receive delegates from the princes had a wholesome effect, and it was specially efficacious upon Orleans' timidity. The duke soon reached the condition where he was ready to abandon Condé, and desired peace on any terms.[5] In September the Hotel de Ville sent delegates to the king, but those also he refused to receive. The city, he told them, after the massacres of July, had illegally chosen

[1] Condé à Lenet, Sept. 22d. "Tout est en si bon estat, que nous pourrions tout ce que nous voudrions."

[2] Mazarin à Tellier, Mss. 4211., 180. Letter of Sept. 19th.

[3] Servien à Mazarin, Oct. 2d.

[4] *Ibid.* Sept. 9th, Mss. 4211., 133.

[5] Tellier à Mazarin, Oct. 4th, Mss. 4212.

Broussel for the provost of merchants, and Beaufort was acting as its governor without authority from the king. While they continued at the head of the city government, the king could not regard any delegates chosen at the Hotel de Ville as representatives of the people of Paris.[1]

But private bodies sent supplications to Compiègne, asking for the speedy return of the king, and all such were well received. The six companies of merchants followed the example of the clergy, and expressed their desire for an entire restoration of harmony between his majesty and his subjects of Paris.[2] On September 24th a public meeting was called to favor the unconditional return of the king. About four thousand met and passed resolutions demanding peace with the king, the retreat of the foreign troops, and the resignation of the illegally chosen officials. The city was still under the control of the princes, and they prevented further meetings of the sort, but the effect of this was not inconsiderable.[3] Broussel tendered his resignation as provost of the merchants, and Orleans gave passports to the delegates whom the merchants wished to send to the king. He himself was weary of war, alarmed at every disturbance, and apprehensive of being deserted both by Paris and the prince. It was evident that the city was returning to the service of the king, and the leaders quarrelled about the responsibility for the loss. Orleans told the prince that he had given him Paris, and Condé replied that he gave him twelve thousand men with which to hold it.[4]

The plundering by Lorraine's soldiers created such hatred in the city, that even that freebooter began to find his position uncomfortable. On October 11th he

[1] Registres de l'Hotel de Ville, iii., 237–264.

[2] This was after the meeting of September 24th.

[3] This meeting is described in the correspondence of Mazarin's agents, and by the adherents of the princes, with considerable discrepancy. There is no doubt as to the results which followed. The Venetian ambassador wrote it was dispersed by military force.—cxv., 52.

[4] Lettre de Martigny à Lenet, Sept. 25th. Lettre de Rochefoucauld à Lenet. Mém. de Berthod. Lettres de Tellier à Mazarin, Sept.

was pursued by an angry crowd, who declared they would hold him a prisoner until he gave satisfaction for the pillage that had been committed by his soldiers. He made his escape, but he did not desire to return again to Paris, and he obtained a treaty from the king allowing him to lead his army from France without being attacked.[1]

Beaufort tried in vain to keep the people zealous, by talking of that long-established union between the Parliament and the princes, which alone could bring a secure and honorable peace.[2] The time for such appeals was past. The Hotel de Ville and the Parliament united in asking Orleans to remove the foreign mercenaries who were devouring the land. Condé was unable to accomplish any thing against the popular sentiment. Paris was weary of his violence, and he in turn was weary of Paris. He did not wish to return to Guienne, where he would also have to meet the complaints and uncertainties of city officers and organizations. The life of a princely highwayman like Lorraine was congenial to his tastes, and unless he could have an authority in France like that of a general in a camp, he was eager to do all in his power to injure his fatherland.

On October 13th Lorraine and Condé led away their troops and marched towards Liege and Stenai.[3] For seven years Condé commanded Spanish armies against his countrymen.

The retreat of these armies left the way open for the return of the king, but it was desired that other leaders of the Fronde should leave Paris, to ensure its tranquillity. Mazarin wrote that the king could not be safe in the capital until Orleans, Retz, and Beaufort were out of it, and that the unruly members of the Parliament must also be expelled.[4] Orleans became constantly more terrified. He was urged by Chateauneuf and Retz to excite the people, and

[1] Aff. Etr. Fr., 885, 47.

[2] Dis. Ven., cxv., 66, 67.

[3] Muse Historique, Oct. 19th. Tellier à Mazarin, Oct. 13th. Lettres de Paris, Oct. 18th, published by M. Cousin.

[4] Mazarin à Tellier, Mss. 4211., 113, 114; à Fouquet, 23,202, Oct. 12th.

erect new barricades against the entry of the king. But he feared such dangerous counsels, and he agreed to leave the city, and make no opposition to the restoration of the royal authority.[1] Beaufort obtained the promise of 100,000 livres, and, on October 14th, he resigned his position as governor of Paris. Mazarin would have been glad to have accompanied the king on his triumphal entry into the stronghold of the Fronde, but it was thought best to improve the favorable condition of public feeling, without waiting for his return. The cardinal wrote, that if the king could enter Paris and be again established at his capital in tranquillity and the full possession of his authority, he wished no delay from any regard for his personal interests.[2] Orleans had as yet received no assurance of the terms on which he could retire, and, on the 19th, he sent word to the city officers that unless those were agreed on, he would resort to any measures. But no one heeded his threats. On the 21st the king slowly proceeded towards the city from Saint Germain, accompanied by Turenne's soldiers and met by great bodies of citizens and officials. It was dark before they reached Paris, and the procession marched by the light of torches through the Cours de la Reine and the gardens of Renard, and Louis XIV. slept that night in the palace of the Louvre. Though he was received with applause and with no attempt at disturbance, strong guards were stationed about the Louvre, and soldiers were encamped near the city.[3]

The king had returned amid acclamation, and it was resolved that he should reign with authority. The Duke of Orleans was ordered to leave the city at once, and it was decided to arrest him if he refused. He asked to be allowed to stay until the morning, and his request was granted. At five o'clock on the 22d he left Paris, accompanied by Beaufort and Chabot Rohan, and retired to Li-

[1] Tellier à Mazarin, Mss. 4212., 189–199, *et pas.*

[2] Mazarin à Tellier, Oct., Mss. Bib. Nat., 6890; à Fouquet, Mss. 23,-202. Servien à Mazarin, Oct. 12th, etc.

[3] Tellier à Mazarin, Oct. 20th and 22d, Mss. 4212. Mém. de York, 556, 557. Berthod, 598–599.

mours.[1] The political rôle of all three was ended. Terms were granted Orleans by which he agreed to disband the troops levied in his name. He was allowed to enjoy his appanage and his wealth, and he retired to the quiet city of Blois. He died in 1660, but after his departure from Paris he had no political influence, and he spent his days in the indolent luxury of a royal prince. He ended his career, appropriately, by disclosing to Le Tellier the violent measures to which he had been urged by his associates, and by becoming a witness against his friends.[2] For over a quarter of a century the rank and the restless disposition of Gaston of Orleans had made him the centre of the intrigues and insurrections against the royal authority, and against the two cardinals by whom it was successively administered. His career had been a record of cowardice, vacillation, and treachery; he had never kept his word, and he had always betrayed his friends. He crowned the failures of his life, by an unsuccessful attempt to destroy the beauty of the chateau of Blois. Retz claims he had prophesied to Orleans that the result of their intrigues might be, that the duke would find himself a royal prince retired to Blois, and that Retz would be a cardinal imprisoned at Vincennes. Part of this prediction was now fulfilled, and the rest was soon verified.

Mademoiselle of Orleans was also ordered to leave Paris. She had reproached her father for his resolution to abandon the cause of Condé, and submit himself to Mazarin. When they sold lanterns "à la royale" to celebrate the king's return, she said she wanted to buy lanterns "à la Fronde." If the others left Paris, she would stay there with only her *femmes de chambre*, and brave the king. Her father told her it was time to abandon the role of a heroine, but she replied that her ancestry was such, that she could do nothing except what was elevated and great. But she was obliged at last to

[1] Mss. Bib. Nat., 4212., 190, 191.

[2] Tellier à Mazarin, Oct. 30th. The details of Orleans' negotiations and treaties are found in Mss. 4212., 332, *et seq.*

yield, and leave Paris, and she ended her political career, courageous and absurd to the last.[1]

Another leader of the Fronde soon followed. On November 18th Chateauneuf was ordered to retire to Berri, and there he died during the next year.[2] The duchesses of Montbazon and Chatillon were also compelled to leave Paris.

But the treatment of the Parliament presented a question of much more importance for the country, than ending the career of some unscrupulous politicians, and of some dissolute women. The Parliament of Pontoise was recalled to Paris, and on the morning of October 22d Louis held a bed of justice at the Louvre A number of royal declarations were read, affecting the present condition of affairs, and the future organization of the body. A free amnesty was again granted to all those who, within three days, should submit to the king and renounce all alliances with the enemies of the state. The Parliament was formally transferred to Paris, but the authority was recognized of those who had attended at Pontoise, in conformity with the order of the king. All acts of those who had remained at Paris were declared to be void. The Parliament was ordered in the future to assume no control over the general matters of the state, and to attempt no direction of the public finances. It was to be simply a court, for the decision of lawsuits. As its members had often been led into evil courses by the influence of others, they were forbidden to hold any office or receive any pension from princes or noblemen. Finally, Beaufort together with Broussel and nine other members of the Parliament were banished from the city.[3]

The king had before endeavored to prevent the Parliament's becoming a political body, and exercising a restraint upon his authority. But the edict that was now registered, was to be enforced. It was just four years since the

[1] Dis. Ven., cxv., 75–80. Mss. 4212., 191. Mém. de Montpensier, 144–9.
[2] Tellier à Mazarin, Nov. 18th.
[3] Journal du Parlement, 1652, 235–252.

edict of October, 1648, had seemed to recognize in the Parliament of Paris a political authority embarrassing to the king and important to the state. The manner in which the judges sought to preserve and to exercise that authority, prevents any regret that the king was at last successful in his efforts to overthrow it. The reformation of the government of France could not have been effected by making a legislature of a court. Such an endeavor was now abandoned, and the edict of October 22, 1652, may be regarded as the end of the Parliamentary Fronde. A few months more were employed in overcoming the resistance of Condé's followers, and in quieting the troubles of Guienne.

There were members of the Parliament who were offended by these edicts, and would have been glad to have resisted them, but it was impossible to make any effective opposition, either in or out of the body. Those who had been most active in such matters were now exiled, and no barricades were raised in behalf of Broussel, when he was a second time attacked by the royal authority. He had allowed himself to be so far involved in the violence and massacre of the summer, that he had lost the popular veneration which alone made him of importance. Some of the judges had been secured in the interests of the government by pensions and favors, many had long been weary of the violent courses into which their body had been led, and those who still desired to be unruly dared not oppose the order of the king.[1]

The Bastille was still under the command of Broussel's son. Its surrender was at once demanded, but he replied that he held it under the authority of the Duke of Orleans, and he could yield it only by his order. He was told that he must surrender it to his king, or it would be bombarded forthwith. He consented to give possession to the king, but he obtained 40,000 livres as compensation for resigning his office as governor.[2]

One formidable leader of the Fronde remained at Paris,

[1] Dis. Ven., cxv., 75.

[2] Mss. 4212., 190.

and though his power was much reduced, he still excited apprehension among his former opponents. The Cardinal Retz had endeavored to take an active part in the popular demonstrations for the king's return, but with little success. He asked Turenne to assure Mazarin of his good-will, and to suggest a marriage of his nephew with the minister's niece. The cautious general declined to do any thing more than simply convey the message, and Mazarin replied there was reason to believe that Retz's promises to aid only came from his inability to harm;[1] tranquillity and obedience to the king could not be assured while Retz remained in Paris.[2] Servien and Le Tellier were equally distrustful of the cardinal's turbulence. Retz himself was annoyed that he had not played a more active part in the late events, and he pursued a vacillating course. He was quite willing to have the favor of the Court, but he found it difficult to abandon the endeavors to excite popular disturbances, which had so long been his employment and his pleasure. He coquetted with Condé and excited mistrust by such advances.[3]

He was offered a retreat that would have been honorable and agreeable. The Court was willing to send him as its representative to Rome.[4] Mazarin had declined such a suggestion for himself when it was made a year before, but Mazarin had actually held the power which Retz had only anticipated holding. Retz's talents would be valuable to his government at Rome, and he could exercise a great influence in the intrigues of the papal curia. The prospect was not distasteful to him, but he delayed in making the agreement to accept this position and leave Paris. He was embarrassed by the enormous debts he had incurred, he desired to obtain favors for some of his friends, and he still overestimated the power which he held in the city, and the terms which he could compel the

[1] "Il y à grande apparence qu' elles ne proviennent que de l'impuissance de continuer à mal faire." Mss. Bib. Nat., 4211., 410. Mém. de Turenne, 449, 450.

[2] Mazarin à Fouquet, Oct. 26th. Mss. 23,202.

[3] Lenet à Condé, Dec. 12th. Mazarin à Fouquet, Dec. 17th.

[4] *Ibid.*, Joly, 82.

government to grant. His position as a cardinal, and the great influence which he had possessed among the inhabitants of Paris would, he believed, prevent the king from attempting his arrest.

But the ministers resolved that Retz should be arrested, and Mazarin approved their decision.[1] Retz had discontinued his visits to the Louvre, and it was difficult to find an opportunity to take him into custody. His residence in the cloisters of the archbishop's palace he had made almost a fortress, and from there he could easily escape into Notre Dame. The king ordered him to be taken dead or alive, but it was not desirable that a cardinal of the church should be torn by violence from the altar of his cathedral. But he delivered himself into the hands of his enemies. Acting under the treacherous counsel, it is said, of some female adviser, on December 19th he again visited the Louvre, in order to dispel the mistrust excited by his absence. The news was brought that Retz would soon be there, and preparations were hastily made for his arrest. The king greeted him with the affability that so often beguiled those who had been selected for punishment. Louis presently retired to hear mass, and the cardinal offered to help in its celebration. Apprehensive, however, of some preparations that he noticed, he decided to retire, but as he reached the ante-chamber he was at once arrested. He was taken to the prison of Vincennes and kept in close confinement for fifteen months, and was then transferred to Nantes, where he remained until his escape. He complained that his person was searched, but nothing more important was found than part of his sermon for the next Sunday.[2]

No public agitation followed the arrest of the coadjutor of Paris. In acquiring the dignity of a cardinal he had

[1] Le Tellier à Mazarin, Nov. 26th, Dec. 1st, Mss. 4212. Mazarin à Le Tellier, Dec. 3, 8, etc., Mss. Bib. Nat., 4211 and 6891. Mazarin à Fouquet, Dec. 2d, Mss. 23,202.

[2] Le Tellier à Mazarin, Dec. 18th and 20th. Paulin à Mazarin, Dec. 25th. Letters de Colbert, 1,403. Mém. de Retz, iv., 156 *et seq.* Joly, 81–5.

lost his hold on the populace.[1] But his position in the church led the clergy to make some exertions in his behalf. Mazarin, himself, felt that it was embarrassing to have it announced that one cardinal had been arrested by the order of another. He had indeed advised the policy which the government had pursued; the leaders, he had said, must be expelled; only by vigor and firmness could the authority of the king and the happiness of his subjects be assured.[2] He had expressly approved the arrest of Retz, though he affected to regret that the advisers of the king should have felt constrained to such an act.[3]

But Mazarin was desirous that these acts of severity should seem to proceed from the government while he was absent, and that his own return should be associated with a renewed era of mildness. He was exceedingly anxious to overcome the personal hostility to which he had so long been subject, and he wrote his agents at Paris to use every effort to inspire the inhabitants with favorable sentiments towards himself.[4] He now sent a letter to the king asking the release of his brother cardinal. This was published, together with Louis' answer, showing why the interests of the state required his imprisonment. But it was easy to see that one man was playing all the parts in the comedy.[5] The curés of Paris and the chapter of Notre Dame presented their petitions for Retz's release. He was their religious superior, and he was also popular among them. They were incited both by their zeal for the privileges of the church, and by their affection for their pastor. For forty hours prayers were said for the liberty of Cardinal Retz, and some even wished to close Notre Dame and the churches of Paris. But Retz's uncle, the archbishop, had been jealous of his nephew, and he showed little zeal in his behalf. He presented the petitions of the clergy to the

[1] Dis. Ven., cxv., 113.

[2] Mazarin à Fouquet, Oct. 25th. Mss. 23,202, cipher.

[3] Letter of Dec. 23d, etc. [4] Mazarin à Fouquet, *passim*. Mss. 23,202.

[5] Dis. Ven., cxv., 120. "Comedia, nella quella il Cardinale fa tutti le parti."

Court in a very apologetic manner, and refused to allow Notre Dame to be closed. Condé offered his services to Retz, and an effort was made to combine their friends in some action against the government. Few however were disposed to undertake any thing more than polite petitions for the cardinal's release. One or two priests, who made themselves conspicuous by the fervency of their prayers that Retz might be delivered from the hands of his enemies, were arrested, and it began to be said that Mazarin had decided to imitate Richelieu, and adopt a policy of rigor instead of mildness.[1] Innocent X. sent a legate to demand that the cardinal should be released, or be turned over to the officers of the church, to consider any charges that were made against him. The French government refused to entertain this request. The king, it was said, had the right to proceed against cardinals who were French subjects, if they had committed any offence against the state. He could not recognize the jurisdiction of the Pope, even to present remonstrances on such a matter. The envoy was reminded, also, that while the Holy Father now professed a special interest in any wrong committed upon one of his cardinals, he had been entirely undisturbed when the Parliament of Paris had offered 150,000 livres for the head of Cardinal Mazarin.[2] Retz remained in prison, complaining of the treatment he received, and disturbed by the fear that his enemies might quietly dispose of him. Secret murder was not an unknown device among Italian politicians, but it was never resorted to by Mazarin.

There now seemed no reason why the minister should not return to Paris. The Parliament was quiet. Condé and Orleans had been driven from the city. Retz was in prison. On October 26th, immediately after the king had made his entry, he sent a letter to Mazarin saying that his rebellious subjects still continued in arms, though they had claimed that the cardinal's departure was all that they desired, and there was no reason why he should not return, and the crown again enjoy his assistance and good

[1] *Ibid.*, 120. Joly, 85–90. [2] Dis. Ven., cxv., 163–6. Retz iv., 181.

counsel.[1] His friends told him that he could come to Paris in entire safety. Rooms were prepared for his accommodation.[2] The queen sent word that she was dying of impatience for his return. But Mazarin showed no haste. He was willing that more time should be given to judicious endeavors to turn the Parisians from the personal hostility, which they had for so many years cherished against him. He was willing to remain absent, while the king was occupied in exiling nobles and judges, imprisoning cardinals, and curtailing the power of the Parliament.

Important matters demanded his care, and he wished to give his personal attention to resisting the arms of Condé and the Spanish, and regaining some part of the great losses which France had suffered during the year. Though the success of the French armies was often affected by the inefficiency of commanders, and by the financial disorders of the country, the wars under Richelieu and Mazarin had shown how far superior France was to the disunited government of Germany and the decayed government of Spain. Richelieu had met with moderate success when he first became involved in wars in Germany and with Spain, but the end of his administration saw the arms of France victorious in every quarter. The first five years of Mazarin's administration had been still more brilliant, and such successes had obtained the Peace of Westphalia. The war with Spain continued, but the campaign of 1648 showed that France single-handed was more than a match for her antagonist. But in that year internal agitations began to weaken the country. The finances were soon in a state more deplorable than their usual bad condition. In many provinces the collection of taxes was paralyzed. The few soldiers who could be paid and fed had to be employed against armies of Frenchmen, instead of against the armies of Spain. Notwithstanding

[1] Mss. 6892, Bib. Nat.

[2] Lettres de Colbert, t. I, Nov. 1st. Aff. Etr. Fr., 885, p. 127. Dis. Ven., cxv., 81.

these misfortunes, though France gained nothing in 1649, she lost but little. Ypres, however, was taken by the Spanish. Mazarin failed in his attempt to capture Cambrai, and this disaster was viewed with satisfaction by innumerable Frenchmen. In the next year, 1650, the followers of Condé were in active revolt in many provinces. They at once sought Spain as an ally, which the Parliamentary Fronde had refused to do. The nobles, less patriotic than the judges, called the Spanish to the invasion of France, and, under the leadership of French generals, foreign troops laid waste Champagne and Picardy, and penetrated almost to the gates of Paris. While Mazarin was endeavoring to overcome the resistance of Bouillon and Rochefoucauld in Guienne, Piombino and Porto Longone were lost to France. In Catalonia the influence of that kingdom was fast being destroyed, and Mazarin tried in vain to send additional troops and money for its protection. The people, however, still remained attached to the country of their adoption, and they succeeded in preventing their reconquest by Spain. After peace had been restored in Guienne, Mazarin went to Champagne, and the victory of Rethel rescued that province from the ravages of foreign troops. That victory had been followed by the cardinal's overthrow.

Since the beginning of the Fronde, France had ceased to hope for any advantage in the war. The best that could happen was that she should lose little. During the early part of 1651 Condé engaged the attention of the Spanish with negotiations for a new alliance against his country, and in October he was again in revolt. The archduke contented himself with recapturing Furnes and some places in Flanders, but the treason of Marchin left Catalonia in a still more critical position. In 1652 both Orleans and Condé had armies engaged against the government, and the Spanish sent troops to their assistance. Guienne was in revolt and Provence was much disturbed by internal dissensions. Paris was in the hands of the insurgents, and its inhabitants were paying taxes to the

princes instead of to the king. The year was one of disaster in every section where the war waged. The Venetian minister wrote that former years had been filled with constant victories for France, but now every week brought the news of some loss.[1] There were no important defeats in the field, for the French had no armies with which to fight, but Spain regained what had been taken from her by years of costly and bloody warfare.

The troops of Lorraine and of the Spanish general Fuensaldana ravaged Picardy and the country about Paris, but the archduke preferred using most of his soldiers, in retaking from the French their important conquests in the Low Countries. In May the Spanish attacked Gravelines, which had been taken from them in 1644, after a siege of two months. Its garrison was small and in no condition to make a successful resistance, and on May 18th the place surrendered.[2] It was a severe blow to Mazarin, but while the armies of the king were inferior in numbers to those of the rebels against his authority, no aid could be given to the places attacked by the Spanish. The cardinal tried to obtain the assistance of England and made the most liberal offers, but Cromwell was still coquetting between Spain and France, and he would not make a treaty of alliance.

The archduke resolved to attempt a still more important conquest. He blockaded Dunkirk, and in August he began a regular siege of the place. The only way in which supplies and reinforcements could be introduced into the town was by water. The Duke of Vendôme was ordered to bring some vessels from La Rochelle, but he was met by the Spanish ships and those of Condé's ally the Count of Daugnon. After an encounter, he was obliged to put back, and he could get no money with which to repair his ships or obtain further supplies.[3] Orders were then given to collect all the barks and vessels that could be

[1] Dis. Ven., cxv., 77. Montglat, 279.

[2] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 183, 210. "L'avviso ha colpito il Cardinale nel piu vivo."

[3] Le Tellier à Mazarin, Aug. 23, 1652, Mss. Bib. Nat., 4212.

found at Calais and Boulogne, and attempt the relief of Dunkirk. On September 14th, seven vessels and some fire ships set sail. The Spanish ships were under the Marquis of Leyde, who was eager to conquer the place which he had been obliged to surrender six years before, but he was saved the necessity of opposing the entrance of these reinforcements. The English claimed that some of their merchant-ships had suffered from French pirates, and they avenged themselves in any manner they saw fit. Cromwell was then using every effort to develop the power of England on the sea, and he proceeded with little regard for the rights of other powers. A fleet of fifty-four sail attacked the French ships, proceeding to the rescue of Dunkirk, and captured them all. The last hope of relief was now gone, and on September 16th the city surrendered to the Spanish. The lack of supplies and the hostility of the English had cost France this important seaport.[1] The French charged that Leyde had promised the English commander 4,000 scudi if he would prevent the reinforcements reaching Dunkirk. They asked reparation for this act and the restoration of the vessels. But their complaints received little attention. They were told that the vessels would be held as a reprisal for damages done by privateers sailing under French letters of marque, and they were not surrendered.[2] France was in no condition to avenge such an insult as this, inflicted by a power with which she was at peace. Mazarin knew that a war with England would ensure the complete triumph of Spain, and that in an English alliance was his strongest hope for victory over the Spaniards. True to his character, he suffered the affront and continued his endeavors to obtain Cromwell's aid, which, after years of delay and rebuffs, were to be crowned with entire success.

The news of the surrender of Dunkirk was received with exultation in Spain and by the friends of Condé. The

[1] *Ibid.*, Sept. 2d, 14th, etc. Gentillat à Servien, Sept. 17th. Montglat, 279, 280. Reports from Dunkirk, Mss. 4,212., 46, 84, *et. seq.* Dis. Ven., cxv., 48.

[2] Letters of Tellier and Gentillat cited above. Letters of Bordeaux to Brienne, *passim*, 1652–3.

prince wrote that now they were complete masters of the sea.[1]

In Italy the Spanish met with equal success. After capturing Trino, they laid siege in September to Casal, one of the most important positions in Northern Italy. Casal was associated with some of Richelieu's most famous campaigns. Mazarin himself had first gained prominence in the contests for the possession of that city. It had been held by the French since 1628, and they had successfully withstood three important sieges. If it was now lost, the influence of France in Italy would be entirely destroyed. The honor and the power of France, Mazarin had long declared, depended upon holding Casal.[2] But little could now be done to preserve the city. There was no army to send across the Alps. Some money was furnished to assist in the defence, but in October Casal surrendered. The Spanish had for twenty-four years endeavored to wrest it from France, and they rejoiced greatly at their success. It was put in the possession of the Duke of Mantua, but with a Spanish garrison, and the duke became the ally of Spain instead of France.[3]

The greatest loss in this unfortunate year was that of Catalonia. That great province had rebelled against Spain in 1640, and had joined itself to the kingdom of France. Before Richelieu's death it was entirely in French possession, and it was justly regarded as a part of France. Though Mazarin had afterwards contemplated surrendering it, this was only upon the condition that France should receive a still more valuable acquisition in the Spanish Low Countries. During the four years which had been filled with the troubles of the Fronde, Spain endeavored, and with success, to reconquer the province which had abandoned her. In 1650, Mazarin had recognized the peril of Catalonia, and had endeavored to send assistance in war and money.[4] It was possible, how-

[1] Gourville à Lenet, Sept. 22d. Condé à Lenet, Sept. 23d, published Mém. de Lenet, 572–575. [2] See letters to Tellier, summer, 1650, t. iii.
[3] Montglat, 281, 282. [4] Lettres de Mazarin, t. iii., cited before.

ever, to do but little. In 1651 the Spanish besieged Barcelona. After Marchin's desertion they hoped to capture it at once, but it was defended with the courage and constancy of the Catalonian people. LaMothe Houdancourt was again put in command of the province. He had been unsuccessful there when France was strong, and it could hardly have been expected that he could rescue it when France was weak. He succeeded, however, in forcing his way into Barcelona, and defended the city with as much success as could, perhaps, have been anticipated from the scanty means at his command. The inhabitants endured, with constancy, the danger and want caused by the siege, rather than surrender themselves to Spain. Some French ships sailed for the rescue of the place, but they acquitted themselves with little valor. Provisions were sent into the town, but the commander claimed he was not in condition for a conflict with the Spanish fleet, and he retreated. Endeavors were made, both by the French troops and those of the Catalonians, to raise the siege, but without success. In October, after a siege of fifteen months, Barcelona surrendered. Roses was captured soon after. Leucate was betrayed to Spain by its governor for 40,000 crowns. He intended to enlist under Orleans, but learning the king had reëntered Paris, he made his peace, by agreeing to betray no more. The Spanish granted an amnesty to the people of Catalonia. The whole province fell into their hands, and became again a part of the kingdom of Spain.[1]

The loss of Catalonia was chiefly due to the turbulence and disloyalty of Condé.[2] Had it not been for the groundless rebellion which he excited in the autumn of 1651, and which absorbed the energies of the French armies during the next year, Catalonia might have been saved for France and have remained a part of that king-

[1] Dis. Ven. cxv., 77, 89, *et pas.* Montglat, 282, 283.

[2] Don Luis de Haro, the Spanish chief minister, said at the conferences for the Peace of the Pyrenees, "que M. le Prince avoit été cause, par les diversions en France, de la prise de Barcelone, et de la reduction de toute la Catalogne."—Mazarin à Le Tellier, Sept. 12, 1659.

dom. The idea of surrendering it had been scouted by Mazarin and his associates, unless upon the condition that it should be exchanged for the Low Countries. When Spain had demanded it as a condition of peace, they had refused to listen to such a proposition, and if the province had not been conquered by arms, it would never have been surrendered by treaty.[1] It was a national misfortune that Catalonia was lost. This great and important province would have been a valuable accession to France. Its brave and hardy population would have become loyal and industrious Frenchmen, and have added to the wealth and power of that kingdom. For the Catalonians it was still more unfortunate that their lot should thus have been determined. They were not closely related to the people of Aragon or Castile. They were now left to share in the slow decay of the Spanish kingdom, instead of having an opportunity for development in intelligence and prosperity as members of a great and progressive nation.

The king was again established at Paris, and only at the south was there still resistance to the general government. Condé, after leaving Paris, had gone to Champagne, and there united his own troops with those of the Spanish. The forces amounted to twenty-five thousand men, and the French army opposed to them was not over ten thousand strong. They met, therefore, with little resistance, and during October and November, Condé captured Rethel, Sainte Menehould, Bar le Duc, and several other places in Champagne. Mazarin now resolved to make a more vigorous resistance, and to endeavor to drive the Spanish from French soil. A few thousand raw recruits were furnished Turenne, and as the Spanish army was by this time considerably diminished, he assumed the offensive. It was so late that the Spaniards had regarded the

[1] The views of the French ministers on this question are found scattered through Mazarin's and Servien's letters, especially in the correspondence published in "Negociations Secrètes touchant la Paix de Westphalie," and tome ii. of Lettres de Mazarin. The Venetian minister said the next year: "Il punto della Catalogna, che non si puote superare a Munster col negotio, è stato espugnato con l'armi."—Dis. Ven., cxvi., 61.

campaign as ended, and expected to have Champagne for their winter quarters. But they were unwilling to risk a battle, and their army retreated to Luxembourg. The French captured Bar le Duc and some other places. Mazarin was now with the army, and he was anxious to undertake the siege of Sainte Menehould. But it was late in December. The weather was very cold, and the hail and northeast winds were so severe over the great plains of Champagne, that many soldiers perished from exposure. Turenne thought it rash to attempt the siege of this place in such weather, and Mazarin was governed by his advice. Vervins was, however, attacked. The soldiers murmured because they were not allowed to go into winter quarters. The Spanish shouted imprecations against the cardinal from the walls of the town, and the besiegers in the trenches answered, Amen. But the city soon surrendered, and the campaign closed with the gain of a large portion of what Condé had captured.[1]

As the government was resolved to carry on the war with vigor, and hoped the next year to have 40,000 men in the field, it was necessary to resort to new taxation. On the last day of December, 1652, Louis went to the Parliament to hold a bed of justice. He was accompanied by his guards, and the presence of numerous soldiers was a reminder to the judges, that the king was now prepared to enforce his authority. Edicts were read which reëstablished a large number of offices and rights that had been abolished by the edict of October, 1648, imposed a tax on *franc fiefs*, and increased the duty on wine. The Chamber of Justice, which had been established to proceed against the financiers, was now abolished. 700,000 livres were added to the wages of officers of judicature and finance.[2]

The establishment of taxes similar to these, in January, 1648, had led to the conference in the Chamber of St. Louis and the beginning of the Fronde. The government

[1] Lettres de Mazarin à Le Tellier, December and January, Mss. 4211. Mém. de Turenne, 450-452; Mém. de York, 557-563.

[2] Journal du Parlement, 1652, Dec. 31st. Talon, 516. Dis Ven., cxv., 124.

had then been unable to enforce them, and had been compelled to grant an edict recognizing to some extent the control which the Parliament sought to exercise. The imposition of such taxes in 1653 caused discontent among many of the inhabitants of Paris, and was offensive to some members of the Parliament. But the court had proceeded to extreme measures, and the results of its action had been disastrous. It had sought to exercise such authority, that it had lost the power it once possessed. It was weaker at the end of the Fronde than it had been at the beginning. The most factious members were now in exile. Those who would have been glad to attempt remonstrances against these new edicts found no leaders, and they were registered and enforced in silence.

The administration also did away with the restraint on its conduct, which had limited to 3,000,000 the amount to be paid by *acquits à comptant*. The Chamber of Accounts remonstrated, but the king's brother was sent to hold a bed of justice and order the registration of the order of the council. The members of the Accounts were forced to obey, and their remonstrances were regarded as so insignificant that a boy of twelve was sent to overcome their resistance. In January a few hundred holders of unpaid rentes attempted some disturbance. A company of soldiers at once fired on them and checked the commotion. They complained that the government paid its debts by musket balls, but they abandoned any attempt to excite disorder.[1]

All was now ready for Mazarin's return. The queen had long urged it, and wrote the cardinal that if he knew what she suffered from his delays he would surely be touched. He must at least write her daily, and that would be some solace to her.[2] At last he yielded to such supplications, and returned to Paris. The king offered to come out to escort him, but he declined such an honor

[1] Dis Ven., cxv., 148.

[2] Letters of queen to Mazarin. Mss. Bib., Nat., Clairembaut, 1144., 89, *et seq.* These have been published by Cousin.

lest it should be interpreted as meaning that he needed the king's presence to protect him from popular hatred.[1] On the 3d of February, 1653, he entered Paris, victorious over all his enemies, after being twice in exile, and after five years of disturbance. He had borne their affronts, he had yielded to their animosity, he had been driven from the kingdom at their demand, but he had overcome them at last. From the day of his re-entry into Paris until the day of his death, he was the absolute ruler of France. Not only the opposition to him, but the animosity to him, faded away. The cry of "No Mazarin!" was heard neither in public nor private, and even the most obstinate Frondeurs forgot some of their hatred against the man whose fortune had proved itself to be invincible. He entered Paris accompanied by a great following of soldiers, courtiers, and city dignitaries, and he was met by the king. It was a rainy day, but even his enemies admitted that only the rain checked the popular applause on his return.[2] In the night bonfires lighted up the streets, and the next morning a multitude was gathered in his antechamber. All his friends were there, eager for reward, and his old opponents gave him their support for fear of punishment.[3] While the cardinal showed no desire to punish his enemies, the honors and emoluments were bestowed upon those who had been faithful to his interests. It was seen that there was no road to favor, except that which led to the chamber of Mazarin.[4] He brought from Rome his remaining nephews and nieces, that he might have more material for alliances with the powerful families of France and Europe. His niece, the Duchess of Mercœur, entered the city, bringing with her the others of his family, and she was accompanied by as great a following as the queen herself. The marriage between the Duke of Mercœur and Mazarin's niece had been delayed by Condé's opposition. But the duke had remained constant, and

[1] Mazarin à Tellier, Mss., 4211., 606, *et seq.* [2] Lettres de Patin, i., 207.

[3] Lettres de Patin, i., 224. Sagrado, the Venetian ambassador, says of Mazarin: "Rittornato nello steso posto d'auttorita e di grandezza, anzi piu stimato e piu temuto che mai,"—cxv., 150–152. [4] *Ibid.*, 154.

when Mazarin was in exile at Brühl, and it seemed possible that he could never regain power, Mercœur married the niece of the fallen minister. The Parliament claimed that this was an act of high treason, and the duke was summoned before it to answer for his conduct. The proceeding resulted in nothing, and after Mazarin's return to power, Mercœur was soon rewarded by receiving the government of Provence. Fouquet, the procureur-general, and his brother the abbé, had been active and valuable agents in alienating Paris from the Fronde. The procureur-general and Servien were now made superintendents of finance.[1] Fouquet's appointment proved a very unfortunate one, and after he obtained control of the finances, he involved them in incalculable disorder. The clergy were much employed politically, both by Richelieu and Mazarin, and many of them were now rewarded with bishoprics and livings. Various nobles were made marshals and dukes. So many of the latter were created, that the wits charged Mazarin with saying that he would make it ridiculous to be a duke, and ridiculous not to be a duke.[2]

He endeavored in many ways to regain the good-will of the Parisian bourgeoisie, whose hostility had been so persistent and so injurious. The best means to that end was one which he now adopted. An order was given to resume the regular payment of the rentes of the Hotel de Ville, which had been for so many years interrupted. In honor of this and of the return of the minister, on March 29th, he was given a grand dinner at the Hotel de Ville by the officials of the city of Paris. The aldermen and colonels were ready to receive the man against whom they had so often labored. He rode in his carriage through a great crowd, who cheered him as he went. At the dinner, after the health of the king, the health of the minister was drunk amid tremendous applause, and the an-

[1] Dis. Ven., cxv., 155.

[2] It is hardly necessary to say that there is no authority for Mazarin's uttering the words with which he was so often charged.

cient building resounded with shouts of "Long live Mazarin!" When he returned to his palace, the crowd, among which were many women, followed him. The doors were hospitably thrown open, and those who entered were served with refreshments. Who could help loving an affable and smiling cardinal who scattered gold pieces among the men and gave candy to their wives?[1]

The government now turned its attention to those parts of France where tranquillity had not yet been established. There had been disturbances, both in Provence and Burgundy, excited by adherents of Condé or by local complaints. They were not, however, difficult to overcome. Burgundy was soon quieted. In Provence, the inhabitants of Toulon surrendered their city on Mercœur's threat that he would cut down the olive-trees. The new governor conducted himself with moderation, while his predecessor, the Count of Alais, had, by his tyranny and violence, alienated the province and been the cause of its insurrections. Mazarin advised his nephew to restore the good-will of the people by soft ways and by improving their lot.[2] Though the minister had sometimes supported the nobles, whose violence had made desperate the inhabitants of the provinces they governed, such courses were distasteful to him. During the remaining years of his administration the governments of many important provinces were held by Mazarin himself, or by the young nobles to whom he married his nieces, but there were no complaints of local tyranny or violence, where his counsels prevailed.

More serious questions were presented in Guienne. That province had long supported Condé, but its support had originally been given him because he opposed the government. The discontents of the province found their utterance chiefly in Bordeaux, and that city was the scene of the last, and one of the most curious of the chapters of the Fronde.

---

[1] Dis. Ven., cxv., 26, *et seq.* Mss. Bib. Nat., 10,275. Loret wrote in the Muse Historique: "O gens de Fronde, s'il en est encor par le monde, que dites vous de cette affaire." [2] Mazarin à Mercœur, May 17, 1652.

The peace of Bordeaux in October, 1650, had left the city tranquil, but not intimidated, and its citizens were neither attached to the government nor afraid of it. In the next year Condé was made governor of the province of Guienne, and when he took up arms in the autumn he found its people ready to support him in his revolt. The prince was unsuccessful in his campaign, and he was soon embarrassed by dissensions even in Guienne. As early as January, 1652, there were said to be three parties at Bordeaux: one in favor of the princes, one inclined towards peace with the king, and a third so revolutionary that it desired to follow the example of England and throw off allegiance to any monarch.[1] Wearied of dissensions and discouraged by ill success, Condé left Guienne and went to Paris. The insurrection continued subject to his orders, but Conti and Mme. de Longueville represented him at Bordeaux, while Marchin had the principal charge of military operations in his absence.

Notwithstanding Condé's departure, the forces of the king were so much weakened that they made slow progress.[2] Their troubles were aggravated by the discontent of the Count of Harcourt. Harcourt felt that he had not been sufficiently rewarded for his exertions on behalf of the king. He was already governor of Alsace and of the fortress of Philipsburg, but he now demanded the government of Brisach. Mazarin was unwilling to give him a place of such strength and importance, and Harcourt resolved to seize it without waiting for authority. Charlevoix was under-governor of Brisach, and becoming jealous of the governor, he used his influence among the soldiers and drove him from the city. Charlevoix remained in command in defiance of the general government. There were no soldiers with which to reduce a place of such strength, but a woman offered to deliver Charlevoix into the hands of his enemies. He was drawn from the

[1] Dis. Ven., cxiv., 89. One desired "havere modo di vivere all' uso degli Inglesi, governandosi senza obbedienza a monarchi."

[2] Archives du Ministère de la Guerre, 133, Lettres Mai, 26, 27, 28, Harcourt à Tellier.

fortress by an assignation with his mistress, and was captured by the king's forces. He was carried to Philipsburg, and there availing himself of Harcourt's discontent, he offered to receive the count as governor of Brisach, if he could be restored to his own position. The garrison at Brisach was fond of its commander, and ill paid by the king. It continued to hold the place in defiance of the royal orders, and demanded the release of Charlevoix, until Mazarin was obliged to grant it. Harcourt now decided that it was safe to defy the government. On the night of August 15, 1652, he left the army under his command without a leader, and proceeded at once to Alsace. There he assumed command of the province, took possession of Philipsburg, was received by Charlevoix and his soldiers as governor of Brisach, notwithstanding the king's order for his arrest, and assumed the position practically of an independent prince. He did not, however, ally himself with Condé, but waited to see from which party he could obtain the most advantageous terms.[1]

In the meantime the city of Bordeaux was a prey to internal commotions. There, as at Paris, a violent element obtained control, ready for disturbance, and not alarmed by the possibility of radical changes in the government. The literature of the time shows that, in these years of turmoil, views of all kinds found utterance. Among the pamphlets which were published and circulated at Paris and elsewhere, are many which seem to belong to the latter part of the eighteenth century. "Are kings of divine institution?" some of them inquire. "Have they absolute power over our property and our lives?" "Should not the government exist for the good both of king and people?" "The great are great because we carry them on our shoulders." "Kings cannot be allowed to destroy the liberty of a people, to whose consent the monarchy itself owes its existence."

[1] For the discontents and conduct of Harcourt and Charlevoix, see letters of Harcourt and others from Guienne, Archives Nationales K. K., 1219. Archives du Ministère de la Guerre, 133–136, *passim*. Correspondence of Mazarin and Tellier. Mss., 4209, 4210.

Radical views, however, found no favor among the majority of the people. Some were ready to preach the doctrine, but there were few ready to receive it. The element which obtained control at Bordeaux was more actuated by love of disturbance, than by love of liberty.

During the popular emotion against Épernon, meetings, mostly of the lower classes, had been held under some great elms near the city, and from this circumstance a party had taken the name of the Ormée. It now assumed a more definite form, and began to protest against the slackness of the officers and magistrates, who, it was charged, were ready to abandon the popular cause. The Parliament was itself divided into two factions, both of which found followers among the bourgeoisie. The little Fronde was composed of those who had originally sought some extension of judicial privileges, but were disconcerted at finding themselves drawn into rebellion, and now desired a restoration of peace and of the royal authority. The great Fronde contained those who were staunch in the cause of the Prince of Condé. While the Ormée also professed allegiance to Condé, it contained a lower social element than was found in the followers of the Parliament, and was fiercer in its denunciations of any proposal to make terms with the government.

The Ormée was a society composed originally of a small number of active and violent men, and in its organization not wholly unlike the society of the Jacobins. Its most influential leaders were Vilars, a lawyer, and Duretête, a former butcher. The butcher seems to have been an ignorant, violent, but sincere man. The lawyer was an unmitigated rogue. Troubles increased between this society and the Parliament, and on June 3d it held a meeting attended by three thousand armed men, and decided on the exile of fourteen of the judges who were regarded as traitors to the cause. The members prepared a paper declaring their union in the principles they professed, and endeavored to compel all to sign.[1]

[1] Arch. Nationales K.K., 1219., 372. *Gazette*, June 6th.

The offending judges were obliged to leave the city, but in a few days the Parliament again obtained control, and the exiles were recalled and received with great solemnity. But the Ormée was not thus to be overcome. On June 25th these contests resulted in a battle in the streets, in which the society had the advantage. Many of the judges abandoned the conflict and left the city. The Ormée established itself at the Hotel de Ville, and succeeded in controlling for the most part the affairs of the city.[1] The organization passed its resolutions, like the Jacobins, and then compelled their adoption by the officials. This authority was preserved by vigorous measures. Traitors to the cause were expelled, property was confiscated, and other punishments were inflicted. Scenes of violence were frequent, and as the Ormée could count on twelve thousand men, and had the advantage of a vigorous leadership, it became the controlling element.[2]

Under the cover of such an organization, there was much pillaging simply for the individual gain of those who sought a license for disorder and plunder. Condé decided that he would recognize the Ormée as a political organization, and strengthen it by his approval. He wrote his agent Lenet, that in his judgment the Ormée was the strongest of the political parties, and it was best to make an alliance with it.[3] "Conduct our affairs," he wrote again, "so we shall always be in accord with the strongest party, whether it is the great or little Fronde, or the Ormée."[4] Paris, he said, had been lost because they had begun much, but finished nothing. At Bordeaux they must carry their measures through and continue masters of the city.[5] In December, when the Ormée was becoming

[1] Lenet à Condé, June 26th. Mss. Bib. Nat., 6707. Many documents on this subject have been printed by the industry of the Count de Cosnac, and can be found scattered through the eight volumes of his "Souvenirs de Louis XIV."

[2] Mémoires de Cosnac, i., 72. Correspondence of Lenet with Condé, 1652–3. Mss. Bib. Nat., 6707. [3] Condé à Lenet, July 15th.

[4] *Ib.*, August 26th. Many of the letters are published in the Mémoires de Lenet. [5] *Ib.*, Dec. 28th.

more violent against the members of the parliamentary party, the prince wrote that matters must be carried to the end. Those who had been exiled must continue in exile. To consider now the services which they had formerly rendered him, would result in the loss of Bordeaux, and he wished to hold that city at any price. To avoid embarrassment to himself, however, it would be well so to arrange, that all such violences could be attributed to his brother and sister, and no order of his should appear.[1] Conti and Mme. de Longueville followed Condé's instructions, and declared themselves in full sympathy with the Ormée.

The Parliament of Bordeaux continued to exercise a disturbed authority, its members and the Ormée viewing each other always with mortal hatred. The Parliament approved of the action taken at Paris by which Orleans was declared lieutenant-general, and asked to be allowed to send deputies to his council, who should represent the interests of Guienne.[2] The government followed the policy it had adopted at Paris, and ordered the Parliament to meet at Agen. Some of the judges friendly to peace gradually resorted there, and there were two Parliaments of Guienne, each claiming to be the legal body.

It was necessary to appoint a general in the place of Harcourt, and Mazarin selected the young Duke of Candale. The fact that he was a son of the Duke of Épernon made the choice an injudicious one, but the cardinal resolved upon it from the desire that he still entertained of obtaining the young duke for one of his nieces.[3] Contis, Colonnas, princes of Savoy and Modena, were eager to marry into the family of the cardinal, but Candale, whose grandfather had been a minion of Henry III., and whose mother was a bastard of Henry IV., regarded such an

[1] *Ib.*, Dec. 26th. [2] Mss. 6709. Letter of Lenet of August 12th.

[3] Letters from some of the officers of Oct. 17th, to Tellier, Arch. Nat. K. K. 1219, state their disapproval of Candale's choice. Mazarin, in a letter to Ondedei, Sept. 15th, refers to his lingering hopes of the marriage of one of his nieces with the duke, though he thinks Candale holds out the possibility of it as a lure to secure advantages for himself and his family.

alliance as degrading. Mazarin was disappointed in his hopes, but Candale conducted himself with fair judgment in Guienne. Vendôme was associated with him as admiral of the fleet, but while the jealousies of the two commanders hampered the success of the king's arms, they did not prevent it.

The restoration of the king's authority at Paris strengthened the party at Bordeaux that desired peace, and increased the violence of the party that was opposed to it. Plots were laid for the overthrow of the local authorities, but they were wholly unsuccessful. Vilars, the leader of the Ormée, agreed with some priests who were intriguing for the government that, on receiving pardon and ninety thousand livres, he would start a popular movement, which would throw open the gates of the city to the king's army. He was paid a part of the money, and then disclosed the plot to Conti. Father Ithier, who had shown more zeal than skill in his intrigues for the king, was at once seized and tried before a council of war. By the exertions of Mme. de Longueville he escaped death, but he was condemned to be taken through the streets of Bordeaux, branded as a traitor to his country, and then to be imprisoned for life on bread and water. This was not satisfactory to the people, and it was with difficulty they were prevented from tearing him to pieces. When the royal authority was restored at Bordeaux, Father Ithier exchanged his bread and water for a bishopric.[1] An advocate named Chevalier was arrested, having a passport from the king to enable him to negotiate with the Duke of Vendôme. He was tried before a court organized on the spot, and composed of some pastry-cooks, shoemakers, and apothecaries. Two hours were sufficient to put him to the torture, try, convict, and hang him. Filhot, an officer of the treasury, was also discovered engaged in a plot with the Duke of Candale for the restoration of order in Bordeaux. He was tried before a

[1] Lenet à Condé, March 24, 1653. Mss., 6714. Mém. de Berthod, 601–612.

court composed of Vilars, Duretête, and other ruffians, and presided over by the Prince of Conti. He was barbarously tortured, but it was impossible to compel him to reveal his associates. He was not executed, but he was left a cripple for life. Years afterward, when Louis XIV. was at Bordeaux, he desired to see Filhot and asked him whether he still suffered from the wounds he had received as a martyr for his king. "When I see your Majesty, they become dear to me," replied the loyal Filhot. Excited by these plots, the Ormée resolved to purify its ranks, and to exile or imprison all who were found engaged in any such conspiracies.[1]

Such violences did not prevent the growth of a feeling favorable to peace and the restoration of public order. Bordeaux was fuller than ever of faction, but the desire of the people, the nobility, and the clergy was for peace. Only by speedy aid from Spain could the city be kept in hostility to its king and in allegiance to Condé. Spain was asked to send assistance and prevent this important loss, but the Spanish delayed any vigorous action, partly from remissness and partly from lack of troops and money.[2] The most of the province of Guienne was gradually lost to the insurgents. Some towns had been allowed to remain neutral by Conti and Harcourt, some returned to their allegiance, some were captured by the king's armies.[3] The desertion of one of Condé's most powerful allies added to the discouragement of his party. The Count of Daugnon was governor of Brouage and of the islands of Ré and Oleron, and he used his power against the government from which he had received it. He had taken an active part in the rebellion, but as he became convinced that Condé's cause was hopeless, he decided to make terms. He surrendered the governments which he held, on receiving five hundred thousand livres in money, and being made a duke and a marshal of France. At this price the king was able to remove his subject from

[1] Mém. de Cosnac, 52–54. Cosnac was Conti's confidential adviser.
[2] Mss. Bib. Nat., 6713. [3] Lenet à Condé, April 12, 1653, *et passim.*

the position in which he had placed him. Daugnon resolved to make his peace with his God as well as his country. He married his mistress and spent the rest of his life in wealth and obscurity.[1]

Condé seems to have left Guienne to itself. He wrote very rarely and felt, perhaps, that he was powerless to do any more.[2] In this condition, the people of Bordeaux turned to Cromwell as the only person who had the power to help them. Condé had sent envoys to England in 1651, and had endeavored to obtain its assistance against France. It was evident that Cromwell was resolved to make England a power on the continent. The English queen and Charles II., had both found refuge in France, and Cromwell was told that if he allowed that kingdom to regain its former power, it would be used in an attempt to restore the Stuarts.[3] Free trade with Guienne was an additional advantage which England would derive from assisting the cause of Condé. Cromwell so far considered the matter that in 1653 he sent an agent to Guienne, to see what strength his party possessed. But Cromwell's aid was sought by many nations, and he showed no haste in deciding on his course. Condé had permission to raise troops in Ireland, but Cromwell was willing to allow France and Spain also to take soldiers from a nation which bore little love to him.[4]

On April 4, 1653, at an assembly held at the Hotel de Ville, it was resolved that Bordeaux also should send delegates to ask help from England. Three representatives were chosen and accredited from Conti and the city. They were instructed to coöperate with Condé's envoys, and to represent that when Guienne had fallen under the domination of France, it had received various privileges which had often been confirmed. These had been violated by Mazarin and the Duke of Épernon, and for these, as

[1] Mss. Bib. Nat., 6714., 289.

[2] Complaints that Condé sends no answers to his despatches are frequent in Lenet's letters in the year 1653.

[3] Bordeaux à Brienne, May 20th., Aff. Etr. Angleterre, 62.

[4] Bordeaux à Brienne, April 7, 1653, Aff. Etr. Angleterre, t. 62.

well as the wrongs inflicted upon the Prince of Condé, they had taken up arms. The republic of England professed to rescue the oppressed, and it was asked to furnish to Bordeaux and the princes succor in men, money, and ships. In return for this, it might not only hope for commercial advantages, but the English could have some port near Bordeaux for their vessels, or they might capture and hold La Rochelle. If the envoys were asked whether Bordeaux and the Huguenots did not wish to adopt a new form of government, they were to reply that though thus far the Protestants had not coöperated, doubtless if an English army appeared in the Garonne, they would rise and demand their liberty.[1] The envoys were received by Cromwell, but he took no steps to send aid to Bordeaux. Hopes were held out which encouraged the city and alarmed the French minister, but no ships were sent. France, however, was not popular with the party in power in England, and many desired to espouse the interests of Bordeaux and Spain.[2]

On April 27th, the king offered a general amnesty to the people of Bordeaux, but at a meeting of the Ormée and the bourgeoisie at the Hotel de Ville, the offer was rejected and the city declared again its fidelity to the cause of the princes.[3]

The party of peace was, however, strengthened by the steady success of the king's forces. Larmont, near Bordeaux, was guarded by an Irish regiment which had been raised for the service of the prince, and was commanded by Col. Dillon. The men were ill paid and discontented, and they made terms with Vendôme. Larmont was captured and the whole regiment enlisted under the banner of France.[4] After much delay the Spanish sent a small fleet of four frigates to the relief of the city, but they were intercepted by the French ships under Vendôme and three

[1] These instructions are printed in Mémoires de Lenet, 602–5.

[2] Bordeaux à Brienne, March 3d, Aff. Etr. Ang., 62, *et passim.*

[3] Mss. 6714., 299. *Ib.*, Lenet à Condé, May 8th.

[4] Arch. Nat. K. K., 1219., 170. Letter of May 20th.

of them were captured.[1] This success was followed by the siege of Bourg, the strong place which had been given the Spanish on their alliance with Condé. The loss of this place would cripple or destroy the power of Spain in Guienne, but notwithstanding this, they were remiss in keeping it well garrisoned and now made but a weak defence. The French pushed the attack with much vigor. Among the assailants were the Scotch regiment of Douglas and the Irish regiment of Dillon. Pleased with the treatment they received from Vendôme, the Irish, who had deserted the prince, showed much gallantry at this siege. On July 5th, after an attack of eight days, Bourg surrendered.[2] Its commander, Don Usorio, was accused of pusillanimity and corruption on his return to Spain, and was beheaded for misconduct.

Amid the discouragement of this defeat, their ambassador in England sent word that Cromwell would send aid, if Bordeaux could be put in his hands.[3] It is not probable that Cromwell had decided on any such step. He had doubtless held out hopes, but he did not purpose to involve himself in a dying cause, and unless there was to be a general movement of the Huguenots, there was little to tempt him to interference in Guienne. The Ormée itself was divided on the question of a foreign alliance. One section, led by Vilars and Duretête, was in entire sympathy with Spain, while another element, among which were many Huguenots, favored England as an ally, and some even harbored the idea of a separate republic, which should be under her protection.[4] The ancient connection of Guienne with the English, and the sympathy of the Huguenots with the great Protestant republic might suggest such ideas. English agents travelled through the

[1] Vendôme à Mazarin, June 21st.

[2] "Prise de la ville, chasteau et citadelle de Bourg," Paris, 1653. Lenet à Condé, July 14th. Lenet accuses the Spanish governor of having sold the place, but the charge was untrue.

[3] Mém. de Cosnac, 68. The French ambassador wrote July 10th, that England had agreed to furnish four frigates for the relief of Bordeaux. Aff. Etr. Ang., 62. [4] Arch. Nat. K. K. 1220., 164. Letter of May, 17th.

province, and sought to further Cromwell's desire to strengthen the Protestants in every part of Europe.

Among Condé's papers is a curious plan for a republican government, prepared by two Englishmen, and embodying the ideas which then prevailed in England. However unfortunate it would have been for Guienne to have been separated from the rest of France, the government proposed for her offered privileges, which it was long before she enjoyed. The supreme power was to be invested in a Parliament chosen by all except servants and those living on alms. Freedom of conscience and freedom of trade were to be fundamental principles. Trial by jury was to be established, imprisonment for debt abolished, excessive punishments to be done away with, and no one could be punished for refusing to answer questions which would tend to criminate him. The traces of Puritan beliefs are seen in the special condemnation of drunkenness, blasphemy, and lewdness, which were to be punished in prince or peasant, and in the demand for a religious observance of Sunday. The plan contains many of the philosophical phrases as to the nature of government, which were then common in England, were to be still more prevalent in France in the next century, and some of which are found in the Constitution of the United States. "The peasant is as free as the prince," it says, "the one does not come into the world with a wooden shoe on his foot, nor the other with a crown on his head. Therefore every one is by birth free, and has the power to choose the government by which he will be ruled. A man can be compelled only by his own consent, or by that of his representatives."[1]

Condé was not alarmed at the danger of founding a Protestant republic, in his efforts to render the king of France subservient to his will. "To tell you my senti-

[1] This plan for a republic is found, written in very bad French, in Portefeuille du Prince de Condé, Mss. Bib. Nat., 6731. It has been published, with corrections in the spelling and language, in Cosnac's "Souvenirs de Louis XIV.," t. 7.

ments about this cabal of the Huguenots," he wrote Lenet, "who you say are tending directly to a republic, it is not the worst party, and I think it should be sustained, without rendering it predominant. It will not attain its ends, but having this idea of a republic, it will prevent the others from asking for peace." [1]

But the mass of the Huguenot party had no desire to disturb the present government. Their religious privileges had been ratified, and Mazarin's tolerance was rewarded by Condé's inability to obtain any considerable support from French Protestants. Had they continued a political party, such as they were until the capture of La Rochelle by Richelieu, it is possible that Condé's rebellions, and Cromwell's willingness to support a Protestant republic, might have cost France some of her southern provinces.

No action was taken on the report of the envoy in England. The Prince of Conti was a different nature from his older brother. Some months before he had begun secret negotiations with the Duke of Candale, and while he was presiding at the trial of those discovered in making plots for restoring Bordeaux to the king, he had already made his own peace, by which his estates were to be restored to him, and he was to desert the city at a convenient season.[2] Conti now discouraged the plans for an alliance with England, and prepared to place himself at the head of the party for peace.[3]

Immediately after the capture of Bourg, the armies of the king began the siege of Bordeaux. They were directed to press it with vigor, but the desire of the inhabitants for peace saved the necessity for a prolonged siege.[4] Bordeaux was hemmed in on every side. Almost all of the rest of Guienne had been reduced to obedience, its trade was destroyed by the war, its citizens were weary of dis-

[1] Condé to Lenet, March 10, 1653.

[2] These negotiations are fully stated by his agent, Cosnac. Mémoires, 47–66.

[3] *Ib.*, 68, *et seq.*

[4] The instructions for the attack of the city are found in Archives du Ministère de la Guerre, t. 140.

order, confiscations, and bloodshed.[1] Public meetings were held and the rule of the Ormée was overthrown. On July 19th, the Prince of Conti met with a great assembly of citizens and declared himself openly for peace. On the 20th, those imprisoned by the Ormée were released. In place of its red ensigns, white flags floated from all the buildings and the belfrys of the churches, and there was heard only the cry of peace, and Long live the king![2]

Terms of peace were soon made. Conti, it had already been agreed, should retire to his possessions and he was soon to obtain the highest favor of the government by marrying the niece of Mazarin. Mme. de Longueville was also allowed to retire. She was wearied of the disappointments of love and politics, and she desired a life of religious penance. From Bordeaux she rejoined her aunt, the widow of Montmorenci, in the convent of the Visitation. The next year, wishing still more to do penance for her past sins, she returned to her husband in Normandy, and lived with him until his death. The remainder of her life was largely spent at the convents of the Carmelites and the Port Royal, and she often used her influence in protecting the inmates of the latter from the persecutions to which they were exposed. She died at the age of fifty-nine after a penitence of twenty-seven years.[3]

Marchin, Lenet, and the soldiers of the prince were allowed to rejoin Condé. Less favorable terms were granted to the city itself. The government was tired of its insurrections and resolved that this peace should be final. Amnesty was granted to all except Vilars, Duretête, and the envoys in England, but the right was insisted on of reërecting two fortresses which would command the city. The privileges of the province were recognized, but no conditions were made as to who

[1] Lenet wrote Condé that the city had suffered inconceivable ruin in his service and held out till its last piece of bread. Mss. 6716., 59, July 29th.

[2] Mémoire à Mazarin, July 22d. Arch. Nat. K. K., 1220.

[3] "Une pénitence de 27 ans," said Mme de Sevigné, "est un beau champ pour conduire une si belle âme au ciel."

should be its governor, and the Parliament was to remain for the present at Agen. On July 31st the articles of peace were published at Bordeaux, and on August 3d Vendôme and Candale made their entry into the city. It marked the close of the last phase of the Fronde.[1]

The government proceeded at once to erect the castles of Trompette and Hô, and they were made powerful enough to check any future turbulence. The few other towns in arms were soon reduced to obedience. Vilars made his escape, but Duretête was broken on a wheel and his quarters placed on the gates of the city as a warning to others. It was apparently heeded, for Guienne became a peaceful province.

[1] Articles with princes are found Mém. de Cosnac, 95–8. Those with the city are published in "Souvenirs du Regne du Louis XIV.," t. viii., 111–122. The instructions of the government in reference to Bordeaux and other papers concerning the peace are published, *Ib.*, 85–107, 144–151.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE WAR WITH SPAIN AND THE TREATY WITH ENGLAND.

MAZARIN had not only to restore order to France, but to carry on the war against Spain with such vigor as to regain what had been lost during the last few years. He gave much attention to organizing the army and increasing so far as possible the number of the troops.[1] The scene of hostilities was chiefly in Champagne and Picardy. The forces of Spain and Lorraine together with such soldiers as Condé had collected amounted to about 30,000 men, while the French under Turenne were only about 16,000. The enemy claimed that they could capture the best city on the frontier in six days, and that they would push directly on to Paris and dictate terms of peace.[2] Condé believed that if he appeared before that city, its inhabitants would again rise up against Mazarin and join hands with his enemies. He was mistaken in his judgment, but the result of the campaign made the mistake of little importance.

The effective action of the allies was much hindered by bickerings about precedence among their generals. Condé was now regularly enlisted in the service of Spain, and he and the archduke had bitter quarrels as to their relative rank.[3] These were settled, but with little friendly feeling, and Fuensaldana, the Spanish general, was impatient of Condé's dictation. Turenne marched into Champagne and recaptured the important position of Rethel. The Spanish invaded Picardy, and desired to force Turenne to

[1] Dis. Ven., cxvi., 63. [2] Caillet à Lenet, Mss., 6716., 63.
[3] Dis. Ven., cxvi., 45. Lettres de Lenet.

a battle while his army was inferior in numbers. But he hung closely to the skirts of their army, hampering their movements and occupying such strong positions that they dared not attack him. Once the rashness of La Ferté Seneterre, who had been made a marshal, apparently as the reward for constant blundering, placed his command where a battle could have been compelled with great advantage for the Spanish. Condé desired to attack at once, but Fuensaldana remonstrated that the soldiers were tired of marching in the hot weather and they had best wait till the next day. By the morrow Turenne had corrected the mistakes of his subordinate, and his position was such that Condé was unwilling to attack it.

After endeavoring in vain to obtain some advantage over Turenne, the prince at last contented himself with laying siege to Rocroi. It was there he had become famous by his first battle against the Spanish, and he now attacked the place as the general of a Spanish army. It was captured after a siege of nearly four weeks, and Condé long held it as a base of operations from which to harry the neighboring country. The prince was now sick and the soldiers were in much need, having scanty food, and many of the cavalry being without horses. They attempted nothing more during this campaign. Turenne in the meantime captured Mouson, and after that Du Plessis captured Sainte Menehould. When the town was ready to surrender the young king was sent for at Chalons. He hurried over and received the capitulation, and it was added to his list of victories. The generals had advised against the siege of this city. It was late in the season and they claimed that the rigor of the weather would prevent its success. But Mazarin was resolved on attempting it, and it proceeded amid constant rains and predictions of failure. The rigor of the season, the courage of a well-supplied garrison, the unfavorable opinion of generals, all yielded to the fortune of the cardinal.[1] Though with inferior numbers, the French had

[1] Dis. Ven., cxvi., 202.

not only prevented the great advantages which their enemies hoped, but they had gained several important places.[1]

The Duke of Lorraine had pursued his usual course during the campaign, assisting Condé with indifferent zeal, and carrying on active negotiations with Mazarin. The Spanish were weary of so uncertain an ally, and in February, 1654, they arrested the duke and sent him to Spain.[2] He remained there in prison until the Peace of the Pyrenees. The next year Mazarin succeeded in obtaining the services of his army, which were of more value after its general was gone.

Terms were also made with the Count of Harcourt. Mazarin justly said, that giving governors of provinces the governments of strong places in them was one of the most serious abuses in the kingdom.[3] Besides the authority which Harcourt had as governor of Alsace, he was himself in command of the strong city of Philipsburg. To this was now added the possession of Brisach, a place of such importance that its loss would have caused serious danger to the boundary of France by the Rhine. Harcourt negotiated with the Spanish, who offered him a large price for the place, and he refused the liberal offers which Mazarin made him, in the fear that the count would ally himself with Spain and the Emperor. But the cardinal succeeded in undermining him, by a liberal use of money among the mercenaries who composed the garrisons of Philipsburg and Brisach. The men were bought up by secret agents. The soldiers of Philipsburg refused to obey the orders of Harcourt's lieutenant, and the garrison at Brisach was also secured for the king. Harcourt

[1] This campaign is described in Mém. de Turenne, 451–457. York, 563–571. Prince de Tarente, 148–164. Du Plessis, 437–440. All four took part in it.

[2] Dis. Ven., cxvii, 9, He was an independent prince, and his arrest was a high-handed act on the part of the Spanish king. But it was justified publicly by detailing the ravages committed by Lorraine's soldiers under his orders, and showing that his own caprices and fluctuations constantly ruined the plans laid by the allies. The real cause was probably the discovery of his negotiations with Mazarin.

[3] Mém. de Cosnac, 196.

then decided to make terms. He received 50,000 livres a year, and Charlevoix received 100,000 livres in all. They resigned Brisach, and Harcourt was subsequently to give up the governments of Alsace and Philipsburg.[1]

Mazarin resolved that these important positions should be held by some one whom he could trust. He had already received the government of Brisach, but he had been unable to get possession. He now put a trusty lieutenant there under his orders, and he took for himself the governments of Alsace and Philipsburg, when Harcourt finally resigned them. He had done the same with Brouage, when Daugnon surrendered that place. To get rid of danger from turbulent nobles was not Mazarin's only object in these changes. These governments conferred power, and they also yielded large revenues. Though Mazarin had made his ministry sufficiently profitable to build palaces and gather unrivalled collections of luxury and art, he had been in great financial embarrassment during some periods of the Fronde. If his conduct up to that time seemed to him as disinterested as he claimed, he had certainly gained no credit or popularity on that score. He resolved now to build up a fortune which should be beyond any danger of loss. The most judicious step he took for that end was the appointment of Colbert as superintendent of his property. The genius which was afterwards to rescue the finances of France from the disorders and corruption in which they were involved, Colbert first used in building up a gigantic fortune for Mazarin.

The cardinal had no aptitude for such matters, and was a clumsy financier in the management of his own property,

[1] The articles of this treaty are printed in the *Gazette* for 1654, 601–6. M. Cheruel, t. ii., 139, says Harcourt was to receive 150,000 livres per year. He does not give his authority, but that sum seems very large and I think it is a mistake. In a proposed treaty in 1653, when Harcourt was in a more favorable position, Charlevoix was to have 120,000 livres and Harcourt 500,000 in all. Archives du Ministère de la Guerre, 139. 150,000 livres a year seems a large increase for the government to have made in its offer, when it was in a better position.

as well as of the state. He usually received large interest on the advances he made to the public treasury. But his zeal was so great in the success of his plans, that he at times embarrassed himself, by the loans he made in the frequent periods when there was not money on hand with which to pay the ordinary expenses of the government, and still less to meet the demands of the army. Colbert wrote him in 1651 that in borrowing on all sides to help the king, he had brought his own affairs into a very bad plight.[1] The minister was reproached by his employé for his looseness in the management of his estate. "If I had been in charge of your affairs from the beginning," he said, "I would not have allowed the horrible waste you have made of your property. You have given away your best benefices and created great pensions on those which are left. Your Eminence needs some one to check you in your immoderate desire to dissipate your estate." "Your affairs are ruined," he wrote again, "from lack of order and good management."[2]

Mazarin's affairs, when he was in exile, were in such confusion that it was difficult to say whether he was worth any thing, but after he was again securely established in power, he accumulated governments and sinecures, some of which increased his power, and all of which increased his wealth. The income from many sources was gathered and husbanded by Colbert, until he made the cardinal the richest man in France. No detail was so small as to escape his attention. He sent to the minister statements of the chickens and calves on a farm, and reported that there was abundance of vegetables and fresh eggs.[3] The servants stole a great deal of silver plate, and he confessed that this was one of the things which gave him the most trouble and annoyance.[4] Mazarin received from him frequent rebukes. The cardinal did not pay sufficient attention to the matters which his superintendent desired should

[1] Lettres de Colbert, i., 96.

[2] Colbert à Mazarin, June 27, 1651. Lettres, i., 96. *Ib.*, 118.

[3] *Ib.*, 220.

[4] *Ib.*, 449.

receive his consideration. Colbert remonstrated with him about the cost of the covers for the mules, and complained bitterly at the expenses of the stable.[1]

At items of small expense he was less disturbed. Some authors demanded a few hundred livres for publications in praise of the cardinal. "These people," he wrote, "seem very much in need of money, and it will do them twice as much good if they are paid promptly."[2]

Colbert was as eager for himself as for his master. He demanded constantly for himself and his family offices, pensions, any thing that yielded money. Much was refused, many favors were granted, but he continued his solicitations, undisturbed by what he lost and unsatisfied by what he received.[3] He was greedy for himself, greedy for Mazarin, and greedy for France. When Colbert at last succeeded in overthrowing Fouquet in his career of colossal fraud, and became himself superintendent of finances, he showed in the service of his country the same zeal he had shown for the minister. He restored order, stopped corruption, and brought prosperity out of confusion and distress.

Though the condition of the country was much improved, it was not wholly tranquil nor prosperous. A tax falling on butchers was imposed early in the year 1653, and excited such discontent among that numerous body, that they declared they would cease butchering and leave the people without meat. The government deemed it wise to limit the duration of the tax to one year.[4] Complaints were still made of the injury done in some of the provinces by unpaid soldiers.[5] The hatred of Mazarin, which was felt by many, was too deeply rooted to be removed, but at least his enemies had come to fear him.[6] His extraordinary good fortune was now accompanied by rigor against some of his foes, and his position was

[1] *Ib.*, 416, *et pas.* [2] *Ib.*, 205.

[3] There are over one hundred requests for abbeys, benefices, offices, etc., for himself and his family, in his letters to Mazarin during less than seven years. [4] Dis. Ven., cxvi., 34, 45. [5] *Ib.*, 75. [6] *Ib.*, 123.

strengthened when most of the popular leaders had been driven from Paris, and others feared to follow their example lest they should share their fate.

In the winter of 1654 Mazarin allied his family with the most illustrious house in France. "All the great nobles," wrote Guy Patin, "were eager to marry the cardinal's nieces and enter into the temple of fortune."[1] The Prince of Conti decided that such would be a more agreeable lot than sharing the desperate fortunes of his brother, Condé. His agent made overtures for an alliance between the prince and Anne Marie Martinozzi. There were still negotiations for her marriage with the Duke of Candale, and it was suggested that it might be more convenient to give him Olympe Mancini. Conti sent word that this change need cause no trouble; he wished to marry the cardinal, and one niece would answer as well as another. He was finally allotted the Martinozzi, but the dowry allowed her was so inadequate that his agent told him that he was giving himself away for a song.[2] They were married on February 22d, and the bride was so gorgeously attired and the preparations so splendid, that it was said the wedding of the king could not have been more magnificent. It was a strange turn of fortune that thus allied the daughter of a simple Roman gentleman with a prince not far removed from the throne of France.[3] Conti was well rewarded for the alliance. He was given the command of the army of Catalonia and made governor of Guienne.

At the same time that Conti made terms with fortune, Condé was tried by default for high treason. He was declared to have forfeited the name of Bourbon and his rank as prince of the blood, and all his property was confis-

[1] Lettres de Patin, March 20, 1654, i., 216.

[2] "On vous marie au dernier deux." Full accounts of these negotiations are found in Mém. de Cosnac, Condé's confidential agent, 131–150. Cosnac afterwards showed the cardinal that Conti's net income was 400,000 francs, the equivalent of about a quarter of a million dollars, and that sum, he said, would not pay his expenses for six months.—*Ib.*, 194.

[3] Dis. Ven., cxvi., 255.

cated.[1] Condé was as discontented in the service of Spain, as he had been in that of France. He received his pay irregularly. The Spanish were jealous of him and thwarted all his plans by their remissness or opposition. They, on the other hand, felt that they had obtained, at very high cost, an ally whose manners were overbearing, whose strength had been overestimated, and whose fortune deserted him when he was on their side. After the surrender of Bordeaux, Condé had no party in arms in France. He was no longer the head of a rebellion, but merely a discontented general in exile, and their minister reckoned that if England would make an alliance and embark Condé again in Guienne, not the least advantage would be that Spain would be rid of one whose assistance was as onerous as it was uncertain.[2]

In June, 1654, Louis XIV. was crowned at Rheims. There the kings of France were consecrated, and it seemed a fit time for this solemnity, when Louis' armies were victorious and his subjects were tranquil. The ceremony contained many formalities indicating conceptions of the royal office which no longer existed. The forms were those used when the king was regarded as a spiritual as well as a temporal ruler of his people. They suggested memories of Charlemagne and of the times when the acclamations of nobles and people ratified the elevation of their leader. The twelve peers, who had originally owed their creation to the remembrance of the peers of Charlemagne, were supposed still to take a large part in the crowning of the king. But all the six lay peerages, the dukedoms of Burgundy, Normandy, and Aquitaine, the counties of Flanders, Champagne, and Toulouse, had become extinct, and their places were filled by nobles who officiated as their representatives. The six ecclesiastical peerages still continued, but the archbishop of Rheims was a layman and so could not perform the duties of his office, the bishopric of Laon was vacant,

[1] Extraits Mém. Andre Ormesson, 679, 682, 689–91.

[2] Navarro to Cardenas, March 21, 1654, published by Guizot.

and the Bishop of Langres was infirm and unable to attend. The functions of the twelve peers seemed still more mythical, when nine of them were present only by proxy, and six of these represented imaginary dignitaries. The sword was in like manner borne by an imaginary constable, for the office was extinct.

On the morning of the 7th, the representatives of the Bishop-Duke of Laon and the Bishop-Count of Beauvais proceeded to the chamber where Louis was, and striking at the door, demanded the king. Twice they were assured that the king slept. The third time they demanded Louis XIV., son of the great Louis XIII. The door was then opened and Louis was found lying on his bed, as if sleeping. He was roused and escorted to the church. Four nobles then brought from the abbey of Saint Remy the holy vial of oil, which heaven had sent to Saint Remy for the consecration of Clovis and of his successors. The Bishop of Soissons, as the representative of the Archbishop of Rheims, crowned the king. The oaths and prayers were of that solemn eloquence, which is found in the ancient liturgies of the Catholic Church. The king first swore to preserve all the privileges of the Church. The bishop then asked those who were present if they accepted Louis XIV. for their king. The silence which followed the inquiry was regarded as signifying the assent, which was no longer necessary. The king then swore that he would redress the wrong, administer justice and mercy, and seek to exterminate all heretics from the land. He then received the sword. The bishop blessed it, bade him gird it about his loins with might, and prayed that it might be used for the protection of the widow and the fatherless, and to still the raging of the heathen. The king placed it on the altar to show that he consecrated it to God, and it was then given back to him and put in the hands of the constable. The bishop prayed that the king might have all spiritual grace, might enjoy the fat of the land, the fruit of the vine and the olive-tree, that he might reign in health and peace, and that his enemies might be

confounded. The prayers of fifty-six saints were then asked for specifically. After that the bishop consecrated the king with the holy oil in seven places. He was then dressed in a tunic and dalmatic to indicate the garments of a priest, and he received the ring, the mitre, the sceptre, and the hand of justice, and was bidden to humble the proud and exalt the lowly. The twelve peers were then summoned, and Louis was crowned with the crown of Charlemagne. It was adapted for an heroic age and was too heavy for a more modern one. The king was afterwards given a lighter crown, which was the one that was worn. He was seated on his throne, and the Bishop of Soissons first presented his homage, and said: "May the king live for ever." The other peers then did the same, and the doors of the church were thrown open to the people.[1] Their acclamations greeted the king. Officers scattered gold pieces among them, and six hundred pigeons were let loose in the church. The celebration of mass followed, and after the ceremony at the church there was the royal feast. On the 9th, the king exercised the sacred power which he received from his consecration, by touching over two thousand five hundred persons afflicted with scrofula. Officers followed him and gave to each one a sum of money, and the official record says that nearly all of the sufferers were entirely cured of their malady.[2]

The campaign of 1654 began soon after the king had been crowned. Considerable armies were sent both to Italy and Catalonia, but the actions of importance were on the eastern borders of France and in the Low Countries. On the 19th of June the French invested Stenai, a city of much strategic importance in Lorraine, and one of

[1] Saint Simon criticised this procedure as contrary to the theory of the office and to ancient custom. He said the people should have been admitted into the church before the consecration, that their consent might be asked to the choice of the sovereign.

[2] The account of the king's consecration is found in "Sacre et Couronnement de Louis XIV.," published by the chapter at Rheims, 1654; also in the *Gazette*, 1654, 577 *et seq*., the Venetian despatches, etc. The Venetian minister complained bitterly of the expense he was put to from attending the ceremony in the manner required by his position.

the few places still belonging to the Prince of Condé. Louis XIV. accompanied the armies, and he took an active part in these campaigns. Though as yet too young to exercise control, he attended the councils of war, his presence animated the soldiers, and he was fond of the moderate fatigue and danger to which the king was allowed to be exposed. Mazarin usually took Louis with him and inculcated in him a love of arms, which was manly, though perhaps unfortunate in his future career. Those courtiers pleased Louis best who addressed him as the most warlike of monarchs, and he acquired, from taking part in campaigns conducted by such a soldier as Turenne, some knowledge of the art of war.

He now demanded a prompt surrender from the commander of Stenai. That officer replied that he regretted to disobey his sovereign, the guns should not be pointed against the quarter of the camp where the king was, but he held his place under the Prince of Condé, and he could surrender it only by his order.[1] Condé and the Spanish met this movement by the attack of a much more important place, the city of Arras, the strongest and most considerable position in Artois. It was thought that the French would abandon the siege of Stenai in order, if possible, to save Arras, but they continued in their entrenchments, and the attention of all Europe was turned to the fate of those two important places.

Eight thousand men were left about Stenai, which had but a small garrison, and 18,000, under Turenne, marched to Arras in order to throw relief into the town. Many of the inhabitants of Arras were quite as well inclined to the Spanish as the French rule, and the garrison had to guard against the citizens as well as the enemy. About 32,000 men were besieging it under the command of Condé and Fuensaldagne, and Turenne was in no condition for a pitched battle. He attempted to cut off the convoys which brought supplies, and this caused a series of small encounters. Supplies were brought by parties of

[1] Mazarin à Le Tellier, Mss. 4209. Dis. Ven., cxvii., 146.

1,000 or 1,200 men, and in the wide open plains which surround Arras, it was difficult to intercept them. One of these parties met a strange fate. A regiment of cavalry was proceeding to the camp, each man carrying a bag of powder behind him. One of the men lighted a pipe of tobacco, and a lieutenant noticing it struck it from his mouth. The drunken soldier pulled out his pistol and fired, and the bullet went into a bag of powder and ignited it, and this caused the explosion of the other bags. Very few of the regiment escaped. The light and noise of the explosion far off on the plains was seen and heard with amazement by the armies camped near Arras, and the next day, the burned remains of the men and horses was a melancholy sight even for those accustomed to warfare.

In the meantime the siege of Stenai proceeded, its governor making a gallant resistance. The young Vauban was among the besiegers, and here began the career in which he was to become famous as an engineer and a capturer of cities. By August 5th the French had succeeded in blowing up so much of one of the bastions that twelve men could enter abreast.[1] The garrison could now do no more than sell their lives dearly, but the king retracted the threats he had made that they should have no quarter unless they surrendered promptly, and granted them honorable terms. On August 6th the garrison marched out with drums beating and banners flying, but the salutes fired from Turenne's camp announced to those besieged at Arras that Stenai had at last fallen, and they were answered joyfully by the firing of cannon from the city. Two thousand men had fallen at the siege of Stenai, and the rest marched at once to reinforce the army under Turenne. Condé, on receiving this bad news, made a vigorous attack on some of the outworks of Arras and captured them. His men suffered severely from the grenades thrown by those within, which were of a form newly devised by some soldier of Flanders. Condé led them with his usual bravery, but behind the outworks which he

[1] Mazarin à Le Tellier, August 6th. Mss. 4209., 374.

captured, the besieged had thrown up new fortifications to protect the bastion. Supplies, however, were beginning to become scarce, and the place could not hold out many days longer. The Spanish had constructed formidable entrenchments about the city, and Hocquincourt, La Ferté, and others declared that any attempt to break their lines would result in failure. But Mazarin was not afraid of the chances of battle, and he insisted that an effort should be made to save the place. Turenne thought it was feasible to break through the lines, and among the few who were of the same opinion was the Duke of York, who also took a gallant part in the execution of the plan.[1] Whatever his faults when he became James II. of England, the Duke of York during the seven years that he served in the French army showed himself a brave and skilful officer.

The army started its march on August 24th, on a fair, clear night, but the moon passed under the clouds shortly before they reached the Spanish lines. Their approach was not noticed until the infantry uncovered the lighted matches for their guns, just before they arrived at the entrenchments. The wind had risen and the lights, amid the darkness of the night, seemed a formidable and prodigious illumination. Three false attacks were made on the lines, but Turenne conducted the real endeavor to break through the lines, at one part of the entrenchments. It was entirely successful. The enemy were surprised and made an invalorous resistance. The French lost but a few hundred men. They took three thousand prisoners, sixty-three pieces of cannon, and a

[1] The Venetian ambassador wrote home an account derived from some one present at Arras, and says that Turenne also advised against the assault upon the lines, but that Mazarin insisted upon it against the opinion of all. The Duke of York says that Turenne favored it, and his memoirs are the most valuable and accurate authorities for the campaigns in which he took part. Mazarin's letters say nothing of Turenne's opposing this plan, and it is unlikely the cardinal would have overruled his views. Mazarin, however, here and at many times, was entitled to much credit for his resolution to endeavor to accomplish something with the armies, in opposition to the half-hearted or disloyal advice of many of the generals.

great amount of baggage, and only the desire of the soldiers for plunder prevented their pressing the victory still further. Arras was relieved, and the Spanish army abandoned their entrenchments and marched towards Cambrai.[1]

Turenne did not hazard any attack upon the army under the command of Condé. The French marched through part of Flanders, meeting no opposition, and came within sight of Brussels, but they attempted no further undertaking during this year except the capture of some small places. The raising of the siege of Arras was, however, one of the critical stages of the war. Apart from the great importance of Arras, it was feared that its loss might induce Cromwell to turn his guerrilla warfare upon the French marine into an open war, and to accept the offers which the Spanish had long been making him. There was a large discontented element at Paris, and many hoped that Arras might be captured by Condé, lest its relief should add to Mazarin's authority and, by continuing the war, increase the burden of taxation.[2] Serious internal complications might have followed the loss of the city. But the failure of the Spanish at Arras quieted these, and rendered it sure that the French could in the future carry on aggressive campaigns instead of having to repel invasions of their own territory.

Another expedition attempted by Mazarin was less successful than the campaign in Flanders. Refugees and agents reported to him that Naples was again ripe for revolt, and that if a French fleet proceeded there the Spanish might be driven from the city. The cardinal decided on the expedition, and from some extraordinary motive he assigned the command of it to the Duke of Guise. Guise had recently been released from imprisonment in Spain at Condé's solicitation, and upon his agree-

[1] The authorities for the sieges of Stenai and Arras are Mém. de Turenne, 459–466; York, 573–587; Letters of Mazarin to Le Tellier, Mss. Bib. Nat., 4209., 340–387; Dis. Ven., cxvii, 133, 168, 192, *et seq.*, *et passim*; Aff. Etr. France, 893., 175, 187.

[2] Dis. Ven., cxvii, 239.

ment that he would undertake nothing against that country in Naples. It was not strange that the duke should desert Condé and be willing to break his promise, but why Mazarin should have risked such an expedition to a man whose character and abilities he estimated so justly and estimated so low, is incomprehensible. It may have been hoped that Guise still had some following in Naples, but generals of rank, who lost campaigns by inefficiency, were often sent back to repeat their blunders.[1]

The fleet was equipped in a very dilatory manner. The captains had charge of preparing and furnishing their own ships, and such a system naturally caused much delay. Imprisonment had not sobered the character of its leader. He had made for him robes that might be appropriate for a king, and 25 violinists were hired and taken along, in imitation of the musicians who played for the king of France. He sold his chateau at Meudon, and flattered by fair hopes prepared to spend his days at Naples. On October 5th the expedition sailed, consisting of 23 vessels, 6 galleys, and 6,000 men. Its directions were to disembark in Calabria, and it was hoped there would be a rising among the people of that district. But the expedition met much stormy weather and at last landed at Castellamare. Guise hoped that the Neapolitans would rise in revolt when it was known that their former leader was so near, but not a person in the city showed any desire to start a movement in behalf of the Duke of Guise. The Spanish met him with superior forces. The only competent French general in the expedition was killed, and after his death Guise at once reëmbarked his men and sailed back to France. He reached there on December 21st with no great loss, and the expedition was a ridiculous failure. One of Mazarin's most intelligent agents wrote him that the force sent out was too small, it was poorly provisioned, it was delayed

[1] Montglat, 303, says: Guise persuaded Mazarin that he had valuable political relations at Naples. The Venetian ambassador thought favorably of the expedition, cxvii., 243.

until the Spanish had eight months to prepare for it, landing at Castellamare was fatal to any chance of success, and the Duke of Guise was viewed with such contempt in that country, that from the day he was chosen as leader it was felt that the enterprise was doomed to failure.[1]

Guise had no occasion to use his royal robes, but he furnished amusement on his return, by his endeavors to obtain some other property. His extraordinary and fantastic passion for Mlle. de Pons has been spoken of. Although he had already a wife, he had signed a contract of marriage with Mlle. de Pons, and spent upon her as much as 200,000 a year. But his affection had not survived absence and imprisonment, and the duke now brought a lawsuit against her, claiming she had stolen from him a pair of diamond earrings and some tapestry worked in silver and gold.

His former lady-love claimed that these were gifts, and Guise retorted that they were thefts. The parties were directed to appear before the court. They indulged in violent reproofs and invectives against each other, and the conflicting evidence furnished of their former relations and pledges was listened to by the judges with amusement and amazement.[2]

Mazarin's satisfaction at the victory of Arras had been dampened by the news that his old enemy, Cardinal Retz, was again at liberty. Retz, after his arrest, had been kept closely confined in the prison of Vincennes, suffering both from his imprisonment, and from the feeling that the public was very little disturbed by it. The king demanded his resignation of the coadjutorship, but Retz was unwilling to relinquish the office which gave him his influence in Paris. While these negotiations were pending, the death of his uncle made Retz a much more serious embar-

[1] Thevenot à Mazarin, Aff. Etr. Fr., 894., 3. The accounts of this expedition are given in Thevenot's letters, Aff. Etr. Rom., 126. Dis. Ven., cxvii., 115, 232, 330–336, *et passim*. Montglat, 303. Mss. Bib. Nat., 10,-276.

[2] Mss. Bib. Nat., 10,276., 407, 408. "Qui ne peuvent estre entendus de compagnie sans estonnement et sans raillereye."

rassment to the government. On the 21st of March, 1654, the Archbishop of Paris died, and the coadjutor succeeded to his dignity. He had signed a procuration to be ready for this accident.[1] The chapter of Notre Dame met at seven in the morning, three hours after the archbishop had died, recognized Retz as the lawful incumbent of the see, and sent a petition to the king that their archbishop might be at once released to officiate at the solemnities of Holy Week. His procureur was received, and the chapter afterwards recognized the authority of the vicars appointed by him. At ten Le Tellier summoned the chapter by the king's command, in order to have it take possession of the archbishopric as vacant, but its action had already been taken and nothing more could be done.

The government was greatly annoyed by this adroitness of the former coadjutor and his friends, and it declared that Retz, not having taken the oath of allegiance to the king, could not be recognized as Archbishop of Paris. At the same time it was announced that he would not be allowed to take this, until he had been tried and vindicated from the charge of high treason made against him.[2] That the oath to the king should be taken, before the incumbent was entitled to enter upon his charge, was claimed to be the doctrine of the Gallican Church, but Retz's adherents, among whom were most of the clergy of Paris, insisted that on the death of his predecessor he became invested with the office, and that because he was kept in prison and not allowed to take the oath to the king, he was none the less the lawful Archbishop of Paris. The king, it was said, was laying his hand upon the altar and following in the footsteps of Henry VIII. The two vicars appointed in Retz's stead proceeded to administer the affairs of the diocese. His signature to their appointment had been skilfully forged, as his friends had no opportunity to get it from him.

[1] Joly, 92. It is said the signature was a forgery, but it was a forgery committed by his approval.

[2] Arrêt, March 22, 1654.

The holy sacrament was exposed and frequent prayers were offered in all the churches of Paris for the liberty of their archbishop. One priest added to the prayers of the church a special petition for deliverance from that wicked and crafty man who kept their pastor a prisoner.[1]

Such disturbances increased the desire of the government to obtain Retz's resignation. His resolution was somewhat broken by fifteen months' imprisonment, and he feared that he might be sent into still more rigorous confinement. He intended also, as soon as he was at liberty, to claim that any resignation was invalid, because obtained by duress. On March 28th, therefore, he resigned his archbishopric, upon receiving in exchange seven abbeys, yielding in all 120,000 livres. This resignation would only become valid by the consent of the Pope, but when that was received, he was to have the abbeys and be restored to liberty.[2] In the meantime he received some alleviation in his lot, for he was transferred to the castle of Nantes, allowed every luxury and the society of his friends, and comedies were acted for him almost every night. It was claimed that he gave his word of honor that he would not attempt any escape, but as he was still guarded, the parole would not have been regarded even by a less elastic conscience.[3]

His resignation of the archbishopric was sent to Rome, but, as might have been expected, the Pope refused to accept an act signed by a bishop held in bonds.[4] Innocent X. hated Mazarin intensely, and his friendship for Retz was increased by the attacks now made on him. The cardinal's friends suggested that his liberty could only be secured by the acceptance of the resignation, but the Pope replied that the laws of the church forbade such an act, and if Retz had fallen into the hands of the Turks, he must endure it with patience.[5]

---

[1] Dis. Ven., cxvii., 37. Joly, 93. [2] Mém. de Retz, iv., 188–199.

[3] Mazarin claimed that Retz promised he would not attempt to escape, even if he had only to walk out of an open door.—Aff. Etr. Fr., 893., 126.

[4] Lettre à Brienne, May 11, 1654. [5] Joly, 98.

The Marshal of La Meilleraie was Retz's jailor at Nantes, but kept a very careless guard over his prisoner. Retz's friends had the opportunity to concert plans with him, and improved it. On August 8th he walked on the ramparts of the castle, as was his custom. Two of his attendants with a bottle of wine occupied the attention of the guards who were near. The cardinal fastened his red gown on a pole between two battlements, that the sentinels might suppose he was standing and surveying the country. He then slipped down by a rope, was received by his friends, and made his escape.[1]

It had been intended to push directly on to Paris. The siege of Arras was then progressing, and its result was doubtful. Retz hoped that he might take possession of his archbishopric, rally his parishioners about him, and bid defiance to the government. It is not probable that any such programme would have succeeded. Some of the old bitterness remained, but the government became constantly more powerful, and after Arras was relieved the warlike archbishop would have found his position an embarrassing one.

Any such design was prevented by an accident. Retz was thrown from his horse, and his shoulder was so badly broken that he suffered from it for years. The pain and weakness this caused interfered with his journey. Soldiers of the Marshal of La Meilleraie were already in search of the fugitives, and Retz made his way to the sea-shore, embarked in a boat in the disguise of a soldier, and finally reached Spain. As soon as he made his escape, he sent a revocation of his resignation as archbishop, and he notified the chapter of Notre Dame of his liberty.[2] His clergy received the news with great exultation. The "Te Deum" was sung at Notre Dame in honor of his escape. The great bell rang to express their joy, and bonfires blazed at night.[3] The Pope wrote the fugitive, stating his pleasure

[1] Joly, 101, 102. Retz, iv., 200–212.

[2] Joly, 102–108.

[3] Servien à Mazarin, Aug. 14th. Dis. Ven., cxvii., 175.

that the succor of heaven had delivered the cardinal from the misfortunes in which he had been involved.[1]

His escape was exceedingly annoying to Mazarin and the government, and they proceeded against the archbishop with a severity that seemed like persecution. His vicars were forbidden to exercise their functions further, and were sent from Paris, and the chapter was ordered to take possession of the archbishopric, which the king resolved to treat as vacant. Five of the canons, who had been most active in their zeal for their bishop, were ordered to leave Paris, and those who were left, intimidated by this act of vigor, named grand vicars to administer the spiritual affairs of the diocese.[2] Mazarin contemplated also proceeding against Retz for high treason before the Parliament of Paris. That body would have entertained the charge, but such a measure would have been regarded as a grave infringement upon the privileges of the clergy. Mazarin had no desire to excite a grievance which would have united the clergy of France against the government, and would, perhaps, have reduced the annual gift which they voted for the king.[3]

The bishops of Paris assembled, at the secret instigation of Mazarin's agents, and remonstrated against any proceedings being taken before a lay court against a cardinal of the church. A gracious answer was returned to their protests, and the proceedings before the Parliament were abandoned.[4]

In the meantime the illustrious martyr was making his way through Spain. He sold the cargo of sardines which the boat had carried, and raised a little money with which to buy clothes more fitting his dignity. He declined receiving aid from the Spanish government, lest he might give cause for some accusation of treason by dealing with foreign enemies. He was, however, hospitably received, and travelled as comfortably as was possible with his

[1] Letter of Sept. 30, 1654.
[2] Seguier au Roi, Aug. 31st.
[3] Mazarin à Fouquet. Mss. Bibl. Nat., 23,302., 139 *et seq.*, Oct. 8th.
[4] *Ib.*, Dis. Ven., cxvii., 248.

broken shoulder, in a country where inns were so lacking that voyagers had to carry with them all that they needed, even to their beds. He avoided Aragon, because the pest was raging there, and went to the island of Majorca, where he found that the women were all of an extraordinary beauty. The only ugly woman he saw was the wife of the viceroy, who came from Aragon, and she served as a contrast for the sixty beautiful ladies who attended her. The archbishop had concerts given him at the convents, and he declared that the singing of the nuns was passionate and delicious.

He left such pleasures and sailed for Italy. After dangers from storms and pirates he reached there, and on November 28, 1654, he arrived at Rome. He was well received by the Pope. His revenues in France were entirely cut off by the government and he was obliged to rely on the bounty of his friends. He claimed, however, that it was necessary, in order to sustain his struggle, that he should live with much splendor, and by this he also gratified his natural taste for display. Six tables were always served at his palace, and the viands were such as found favor with epicurean bishops and cardinals. He gave large sums to the poor and thus gained the good-will of the common people.[1]

The government resolved to carry on the contest against Retz before the Pope and, as there was no French ambassador at Rome, Lionne was sent there as a special envoy. Innocent X. was very infirm, and Mazarin wished also to prevent a successor being chosen at the next conclave who should be so bitterly hostile to himself. Lionne was to obtain from the Pope, if possible, the appointment of an ecclesiastical commission, to be composed of French bishops who would try Retz upon the charges made against him by the king.[2] A letter was sent to the Pope, in which all of Retz's crimes were detailed. He was charged with having stirred up sedition, preached

[1] Joly, 102–114. Retz, iv., 220–250.

[2] Aff. Etr. Rome, 126., 275. Instructions à Lionne.

rebellion, and with being a criminal, incorrigible and utterly abandoned. Against so notorious an evil liver the Pope was asked to grant justice, and to appoint commissioners that the truth of these charges might be established.[1]

Innocent X. was little affected by such accusations. He declared them to be the voice of Louis, but the hand of Mazarin; the hostility of the minister imagined Retz's crimes, but in truth he was purer than a baby after its baptism.[2] Retz issued a letter reciting the wrongs he had suffered, which was expressed with great ingenuity and eloquence. He had been kept in prison without forms of law, in chains that, at the same time, were fetters upon the liberties of the Gallican Church. No accusation had been brought against him during twenty months of imprisonment. His enemies had sought to despoil him of the dignity, the possession of which was his only crime. When God had granted him deliverance, the archbishop of Paris had been treated in the city of his bishopric, as if he were a bandit or a captain of robbers. Infamous placards were posted in the streets. All the officers of the kingdom were ordered to seize one who was a prince of the church and a minister of God, as if he were a brigand and a public enemy. His enemies had used the sacred name of the king in their violent measures, but it was plain that it was not the monarch, but those who bore a personal hatred, who had devised these acts. Because his person was free from their malice, they now attacked his estate, his friends, and his church. His bishopric was declared vacant, as if the laws of the church had established that her archbishops could be deprived of their charges at the will of a favorite. Though with inflexible fidelity to the king, he would also stand constant for the sacred rights of religion and for the rank which God had given him, and he trusted

[1] Lettre du Roy au Pape, Dec. 12, 1654. *Ib.*, 126.

[2] Lettre d'un Cardinal à Mazarin. *Ib.*, 126. "Piu puro che un bambino d'appoi battesimo."

that soon His Majesty would listen to the complaints of an oppressed church and check those who, under the false pretence of advantage to the kingdom of France, were doing great harm to the kingdom of Christ.[1]

The government took every measure to prevent the circulation of this letter. All the copies that could be seized were burned by the common hangman, and those who had any in their possession were ordered to bring them for destruction within twenty-four hours, under pain of death.[2]

On January 6, 1655, Innocent X. died. Mazarin had already sent to the cardinals who were in the interests of France instructions as to the course they should pursue. The choice of France at this conclave, as in 1644, was the Cardinal Sacchetti, who was a man of high character and learning. Against two only were they instructed to interpose the veto of France. One was Francis Barberini. The other was the Cardinal Chigi, who had been the papal nuncio at Münster, and was thought to have shown too much friendship for Spain during those negotiations. Chigi, it was said, had his head filled with false maxims about the affairs of the world and Christian princes, and was the more dangerous because he had an extraordinary confidence in his own judgment. He was a man that had neither solid learning nor solid virtue, but only a superficial and pedantic smattering of literature and an illusive appearance of religious zeal.[3]

As a result of Innocent X.'s hostility to France, that kingdom had but few cardinals who were devoted to her interests. The French faction numbered only five cardinals. Retz offered to attach himself to it, but under the instructions which they had, they refused to have any relations with him. He therefore joined what was called the flying squadron. This consisted of about ten cardinals, who regarded themselves as free from obliga-

[1] This letter is published in Mém. de Retz, iv., 254–293.

[2] Decree of January, 29, 1655.

[3] Instructions pour le Conclave, Aff. Etr. Rome, 126.

tions to any government or to any other cardinal, and who therefore, as Retz said, recognized only the promptings of the Holy Spirit. The Spanish faction contained over twenty members, and about as many more acted under the nominal leadership of the Cardinal Barberini.

On January 20th the balloting began. There were sixty-six cardinals present, and forty-four were necessary for a choice. Sacchetti received the votes of the French and the Barberini factions, and most of those who formed the flying squadron. The latter, it was said, really preferred Chigi, but they voted for Sacchetti in the confidence that he could not be elected, that they might at last incline Barberini to the man who was their secret choice. Sacchetti was recognized by all as a worthy man, and was popular from his gentle manners; but at this conclave, as at the former one, the Spanish faction would not support him, because they believed him the friend of Mazarin. He received at every ballot from thirty to thirty-five votes, but he was unable to obtain any more. The other votes were scattered, and the cardinals watched for future combinations.

The rules of the conclave forbade any intercourse with the world, but they were not strictly enforced. One of the attendants on Cardinal Antonio was able to carry all of Mazarin's orders to the conclave, by means of some dishes with false bottoms which he had made for the purpose.[1] The cardinals ate separately, and they were supposed to have but one dish for each meal. Many violated this rule and lived with much pomp, and Retz was among those who thus disregarded the traditions of the church.[2] The balloting proceeded with little change. The Spanish minister insisted on the exclusion of Sacchetti, and it seemed possible that a combination might be made on one of several cardinals. Chigi had as yet received no votes, but he had been much in the thoughts of all. His character stood high for learning and probity. He was

[1] Thevenot à Mazarin, Jan. 17, 1655.

[2] Relation du Conclave, Aff. Etr. Rome, 129.

acceptable to the Spanish ; he was the choice of the flying squadron, and they endeavored to make Barberini see that the election of Sacchetti was impossible, and draw him insensibly to the support of Chigi.

That cardinal conducted himself with much judgment. He answered questions with a disinterestedness that edified all. He joined little in the general conversation, but stayed in his cell, receiving no visits. He spoke only of the zeal due the church, and the necessity for studying the Scriptures and the traditions of the councils. No one could accuse him of showing any wish for the pontificate, except the apostolic desire for a bishopric, because it was a good thing. Sacchetti was himself a friend of Chigi, and, having probably little hope of his own election, he wrote Mazarin, commending the virtues of his rival, and asking for the withdrawal of the veto of France.[1] The minister decided to follow this advice. It was not certain but that Chigi would be elected in any event, and if he declared for him now he might hope for credit with the future Pope. On March 17th the French cardinals were notified that the king, having been informed of the merit and probity of Cardinal Chigi, had revoked the exclusion against him, and directed them to support him if it was impossible to elect Sacchetti.[2] The voting for Sacchetti continued, but it was evident that he had no further chance. On April 7th, after eighty days of balloting, all united on Chigi, and he was unanimously elected Pope. He wept when the scrutiny was announced by which he was chosen, because he was separated from his associates by his new dignity. He took the name of Alexander VII.[3]

---

[1] Lionne à Mazarin, Feb. 15th. Aff. Etr. Rome, 129.

[2] Declaration de Lionne.

[3] The history of this conclave is found in the relation already referred to, and the letters of Lionne during its continuance. Aff. Etr. Rome, 127 and 129. Many of these letters have been published by M. Valfrey, in "Les Ambassades de Hugues de Lionne." Retz, t. iv., 293–323, has given an entertaining account of the conclave. It is, in some things, corrected by the letters of Lionne. Retz says this conclave, and all of the conclaves that he

Both Retz and Mazarin hoped to have the active coöperation of the new Pope, and both of them were discontented with the action he took. The question of the position of the Archbishop of Paris was an embarrassing one, and the new Pope's desire was to delay any decision so long as he could, and to avoid it altogether if it was possible. Lionne at once visited Alexander VII. and presented the letter which asked for proceedings to be taken against Retz. The Pope told him that the French were in the habit of writing very long letters, but sometimes the affairs of this world changed, as had the position they took in reference to the Barberini. The ambassador answered they had more reason to complain of the long letters which Cardinal Retz wrote.[1]

The Pope received the letter, but he announced no action. In May, Mazarin requested him not only to send commissioners to France to investigate the charges against Retz, but in the meantime to arrest him and put him in the castle of Saint Angelo. Alexander demurred to the latter part of this request, but said that a commission should be appointed before which the charges could be presented.[2] But his next act disconcerted the French government and was believed by the friends of Retz to show that the Pope was wholly in their favor. At the consistory of June 1st, Retz demanded of the Pope the pallium as Archbishop of Paris. Alexander VII. acceded to this request, and it was given him early in the morning of the next day, before the French envoy received any opportunity to protest against its bestowal.[3] Retz was thus solemnly recognized as the legal incumbent of that office, which the French government treated as vacant.

Lionne protested against this act, and the Pope assumed somewhat of an apologetic tone. He said that the bestowal of the pallium added nothing to the authority of

---

ever attended, were conducted with entire courtesy, mutual respect, and charity, and the appearance of the body was always that of reserve, dignity, and wisdom.

[1] Lionne à Brienne, April 19th. Aff. Etr. Rome, 129.

[2] *Ib.*, May 17th.

[3] *Ib.*, June 10th.

an archbishop, and that Retz must be assumed innocent until he was proved guilty. The envoy replied that if one was accused of crime and the accuser offered to prove it within a month, it had been held that the Holy Father should delay in giving the pallium, and that the letters of accusation of the king should have been regarded as equivalent to such a charge.

The Pope agreed to hasten the procedure against Retz. His commissioners would go to France, and witnesses could be produced before them who would testify, for instance, that on such a day they saw the Cardinal Retz at the head of a regiment, called the Corinthians, levied against the king, dressed in a short habit with pistols in his belt and a green feather in his hat, and that at another time they heard him preach sedition and order the erection of barricades. On evidence of this nature the Pope would consider and make such decision as should be just, without regard to the amnesty granted by the king in 1652.[1] He complained, however, of the scandalous condition in which the bishopric was left, there having been no prelate to administer ordination in it for a year, and the souls of the faithful suffering from spiritual want. The Pope was subjected to conflicting influences, and inclined first to one side then to the other, but he refused to demand of Retz that he should resign his archbishopric.[2]

The offending archbishop now proceeded again to disturb the government by attempting to exercise his authority. The bull for the jubilee was to be pronounced, and Retz sent letters to the chapter, directing that if his former vicars were detained from Paris, the curés of Saint Severin and the Madeleine should act in their place, for this and other purposes. The latter was charged with being a Jansenist, but he was a bold and active man and devoted to Retz's interests. The vicars appointed by the chapter

[1] Letter of June 10th.

[2] Dépêche du Roi, June 4th, Aff. Etr. Rome, 127. Lionne à Brienne, June 28th, *Ib.*, 129.

decided that they had no further authority and ceased to act. The papal nuncio said that he could not recognize them, and they admitted that to continue their functions contrary to the order of an archbishop who had received the pallium, would be to create a schism in the church of Paris.[1] The government was resolved that it would allow no action on the part of those authorized by Retz. One of his former vicars undertook to perform some function, and he was arrested and lodged in the Bastille.[2]

One of the new vicars obeyed the royal order and retired from Paris. But Chassebras, the curé of the Madeleine, carried on an ecclesiastical war with great vigor. In order to escape arrest he concealed himself at the Port Royal and in other retreats. He could have no open communication with the clergy of the flock, and his orders appeared in proclamations pasted up in various parts of the city. The officers tried to arrest those who did this work, but it was impossible to discover them. Discreet agents walked through the streets at night with the bulletins prepared, and, in an unobserved moment, the documents were pasted upon church doors and in public places, which informed the flock of the orders of its archbishop's representatives, and denounced spiritual penalties upon those who disregarded them.[3]

The bishops of Dol and Coutances administered ordination in the churches of Paris without consent of the archbishop. A proclamation of Chassebras denounced this violation of ecclesiastical law, and notified them that they had brought upon themselves the penalties declared by the canons of the church against such offenders.[4] The Chatelet rendered a sentence against Chassebras by default, condemning him for having had dealings with Retz, which had been forbidden to all subjects, and sen-

[1] Seguier à Brienne, June 14, 1655. [2] Bachelerie à Mazarin, July 1st.

[3] Claude Joly, 177. Histoire del'Eglise de Paris. Joly was one of the canons of Notre Dame at this time.

[4] Aff. Etr. Rome, 128., 228. Seguier à Brienne and à Tellier, Aug. 24th.

tencing him to banishment and the confiscation of his property. The curé replied by a placard ordering those who were persecuting the church to cease and repent of their sins, lest they should bring on themselves her excommunication. Many of the archbishop's friends wished him to issue an interdict and direct the churches to be closed. The majority of the curés of the chapter, it was said, would obey such a direction. But Retz was not a Thomas à Becket. He may have feared that the age of à Becket was past, and that the interdict would be treated with contempt. He also cherished the hope of some reconciliation with the government, and he hesitated to invoke the thunders of his office.[1] He adopted in all these struggles an inconsistent position, trusting to intrigue and finesse, more than to the privileges and power of the church, and the result was, that while he caused the government a great deal of annoyance, he was unsucessful in the conflict.

Lionne asked the Pope repeatedly to proceed with the trial of the charges against Retz, as he had promised. The Holy Father replied that he feared the grievous scandal of such an affair, and felt confident that he could induce the archbishop to make some settlement which would be satisfactory. Moreover Cardinal Retz assured him that these charges were utterly groundless, and at most were only raking up some faults of his youth. The envoy replied that he had with him the official proceedings of the Parliament showing that Retz had assisted in its deliberation when in rebellion, and had preached to his flock that they must sell even the sacred vessels of the church, in order to raise money with which to levy war against the king.[2] Retz was an unsuccessful Cromwell, and he was a Jansenist besides.[3]

Alexander VII. was an enemy to the Jansenists, but he thought the relations of the archbishop with them were purely political, and adopted to strengthen his position.

[1] Joly, 124, 125. [2] Lionne à Brienne, Aug. 23d. Aff. Etr. Rome, 130.
[3] *Ib.*, Oct. 18th, *et pas.*

"He has disputed, written, and preached against the doctrine of Jansen," said the Pope. "That he has never sought aid in the purse of the Jansenists, that I would not affirm."[1]

At last, on November 9th, the Pope appointed a congregation of eight cardinals and four bishops to consider the charges against the Archbishop of Paris. Retz said he was quite ready, and that the day his process began he would have one instituted against the Cardinal Mazarin.[2] But the Pontiff did not desire that the appointment of the congregation should lead to the beginning of any proceedings. He endeavored to satisfy the French government by a different measure, and on November 15th, an instrument was sent to Paris appointing a suffragan to administer the affairs of the diocese of Paris. The name was left in blank and was to be inserted by the king. This action seemed to solve the difficulties that existed there, and the intelligence of it was received with great satisfaction.[3]

But when the instrument arrived at Paris, it was found to have conditions which the government refused to accept. The nuncio required to be assured that the assembly of the clergy and the Parliament would recognize this order of the Holy See and make no opposition to its execution. Mazarin replied that the absolute and despotic power of France was in the person of the king, and no organization in the kingdom could pretend to have any part in it.[4] He wrote the queen that to agree to any negotiations with the assembly or the Parliament would be a step most injurious to the royal authority, which could not be dependent on any other. Were it otherwise, the king, instead of being absolute, would be only the doge of the republic of France.[5] The clergy showed also that they could not recognize any such authority in the Pope as he sought to exercise by appointing a

[1] *Ib.*

[2] Lionne à Mazarin, Nov. 1st; à Brienne, Nov. 15th. Aff. Etr. Rome, 130.

[3] Lionne à Brienne, Nov. 15th. Servien à Mazarin, Nov. 26th. Mazarin à Brienne, Nov. 27th.

[4] Mazarin à Brienne, Nov. 27th. [5] Mazarin à la Reine, Nov. 28th.

suffragan for a bishopric, without the consent of the bishop himself.[1]

The French government declined to act upon the Pope's brief, but the Pontiff succeeded at last in having Retz appoint a vicar from a list prepared by the king. The cardinal was loath to do it, but the Pope was urgent; he feared offending him, and he hoped that by thus acceding to the wish of the king he might receive the income of his bishopric. On January 2, 1656, Retz chose the Abbé Saussay as his grand vicar. He sent with the appointment a letter to the clergy of Paris, asking them to assist in obtaining the return of those of their associates who had been banished. But the letter was returned to the cardinal, and no steps were taken towards recognizing in him any rights to the fruits of his benefice.

Mazarin was obliged to abandon his endeavor to have Retz tried before some tribunal appointed by the Pope, for the offences with which he was charged. It was evident that the Pontiff had no thought except to prolong the matter indefinitely, and the dignity of the government demanded that it should cease further solicitation.[2] Lionne was recalled in March, 1656, and the proceedings against Retz were abandoned. But, notwithstanding this, his position was little improved. Mazarin was implacable, and would make no terms, and Retz could not bring himself to resign his archbishopric and thus make his peace. Though Alexander VII. had not gratified the French government by Retz's prosecution, he did little to help him in his struggle, and he did not choose him for one of his confidential counsellors in the administration of the pontificate. Retz loved display and large expense, but friends grew weary of advancing great sums of money to a man who seemed doomed to hopeless exile.

The cardinal had hoped that he might have some hold upon Saussay, but the new vicar regarded himself as

[1] Bishop of Coutances to Mazarin, Nov. 27th.

[2] Mazarin à Oudedei, Nov. 17th. Brienne à Lionne, Feby. 11th, 1656. Roi à Bichi, March 9th.

holding his office from the king, and he would have no relations with the archbishop. Thereupon, in the summer of 1656, Retz revoked his authority. The Pope was displeased by this act and demanded his restoration. Retz refused to give it, and thinking that he had lost any hope of good-will from the Pontiff he left Rome, and began a wandering life. The government issued pronunciamentos against harboring him, and made some endeavors to arrest him. He, on the other hand, indulged in much underground plotting, issued occasional well-written pamphlets against Mazarin, and by various papers and orders caused at times some degree of ecclesiastical confusion in his diocese. But his life on the whole was a very obscure one. He thought at times of resigning his office, but his friends at the Port Royal bade him follow the examples of the holy bishops who remained concealed in deserts and caverns in times of persecution.

He so far imitated them that his whereabouts were often unknown for considerable periods. Unfortunately the imitation was not complete. His follower says that he grew fond of wandering obscurely from tavern to tavern, and that while he compared his lot to that of the holy anchorites, he found consolation in the society of rope dancers and ballet girls.[1] An archbishop posing as Athanasius and caressing Phyllis in a hostlery, was the sight presented to the faithful.[2] When Mazarin died, Retz hoped for some improvement in his condition. But Louis XIV. was true to the traditions of his minister, and he said that the cardinal should not return to France unless he resigned his archbishopric. Retz yielded at last. He resigned the archbishopric of Paris and received in exchange several lucrative abbeys. In 1665 he again visited the Court, but Louis XIV. did not forget those who had been active in the troubles of the Fronde, and Retz was coldly received. He lived, however, with much splendor out of Paris, and

[1] Joly 138, 141. It is true that when Joly wrote this he had quarrelled with Retz and left his service, but I see nothing improbable in his account of the prelate's morals.

[2] Sainte Beuve, Port Royal, iii., 192.

he was employed in the service which Mazarin had offered to him many years before. He was frequently sent to Rome on behalf of the French government, and attended several conclaves in its interests. At the last of these, eight votes were cast for Cardinal Retz as supreme pontiff. During his later years he prepared the memoirs of his life, which are among the classics of the French language.

While the government was endeavoring to drive Retz from his archbishopric, the Parliament of Paris attempted again to exercise some authority over the imposition of taxes. Its effort was checked with vigor. Sixty thousand to seventy thousand men were to be under arms in the campaign of 1655, and Mazarin worked day and night at the preparations. War on such a scale required money; the expenses of the gayeties and pomp of the Court of Louis XIV. were large, and Fouquet had already begun to despoil the treasury by giving enormous profits to his associates among the financiers. A new edict created various offices, imposed taxes on baptisms and funerals, and created other sources of revenue. Its most important provision was one which directed that all paper used in instruments prepared by notaries should be stamped. A considerable revenue was expected to be raised from this duty. Financiers offered to pay eight million livres a year for the farm of it, and those who complained of it said it would take as much as twenty millions from the people.[1] It was the beginning of the imposition of a stamp duty in France, and the government had chosen a proper subject for taxation. It was a duty from which the poor would be almost entirely exempt, and which would fall upon others in proportion to the number and importance of their transactions.

It was known, however, that there would be opposition to the edict, and on March 20, 1655, the king held a bed of justice at which it was registered. But after this forced registration the Parliament resolved to consider

[1] Dis. Ven. cxviii., 18. Journal d'un Bourgeois, Mss. Bib. Nat. 10,276., 325.

the provisions of the edict, with a view to presenting remonstrances against them. On the 9th of April it assembled to hear the edict again read, and the tax on stamped paper was subjected to special criticism. It was said to be burdensome, inconvenient, and offensive, and the members intended to continue their sessions and proceed with the discussion of these matters. There were many friends of Retz and Condé still left; there were many who still dreamed of making the Parliament a great political body, and Paris itself was wearied of its troubles rather than cured of its animosities.[1]

But both Louis and Mazarin were resolved that there should be no renewal of the Fronde. The young king was hunting at Vincennes when he heard of these discussions, and he resolved to check them at once.

On April 13th, he hastened back from his hunting and proceeded to the Palais de Justice, without even waiting to dress himself as etiquette required. He had on a red coat, with a gray plumed hat, spurs on his riding boots, and a sword by his side. No king of France had ever appeared before his Parliament in such a dress. Louis showed manifest anger in his face. It was at this time, that Louis XIV. is said to have answered the remonstrances of the president as to the interest of the state, by the famous remark: "L' Etat, c' est moi." These words perhaps expressed Louis' conception of the government, but he never uttered them. Like many of the sayings attributed to famous men, they are apocryphal. As a matter of fact the king entered the parliament unannounced, and at once interrupting their discussions, he said: "All know how much trouble your assemblies have excited in the state, and what dangerous effects they have produced. I have heard that you claim you will continue them, under the pretext of deliberating on the edicts which were registered in my presence. I have come here expressly to forbid their continuation," he said, shaking his finger at the members of the Inquests, "and to forbid you,

[1] Turenne, 468.

M. first President," shaking his finger at him, "to allow them to be held, which I do absolutely." Having finished these remarks, the king rose at once from his seat, and left the court without giving time for any reply.[1]

The members of the court were filled with consternation at the words and manner of the king, and still more at his dress. Molé had resigned his place as first president, and the position was now held by Bellièvre, a judge who had formerly been somewhat identified with the Frondeurs, and an able and ambitious man. He visited Mazarin, and in behalf of the body represented its consternation at this extraordinary visit of the king. The cardinal adopted the rôle of a conciliator. The dress, he said, was that of a hunter, which the king had neglected to change, and not that of a soldier assumed for the occasion. The motion of the hand was casual, and not intended for a threat. The president reported these favorable words, and held out hopes that the Parliament would still be allowed to consider the edict.

He was sent again to the king to deprecate any feelings of animosity, and to ask that the body might be allowed to deliberate on these measures. Louis replied that he felt no bitterness towards the members, and had no wish to deprive them of any of their privileges, but the condition of affairs did not allow any such assemblies to be held, and he forbade their continuation. The other members of the cabinet thought Mazarin had been too lenient in his expressions. Colbert wrote him that Bellièvre had misstated his remarks when he reported them to the Parliament, and that all right-minded people lamented that he would not so far control his natural benignity as to incul-

[1] This account of the interview of the king with the Parliament, is taken from Journal d'un Bourgeois de Paris, Mss. Bib. Nat., 10,276., 325, *et seq.*, and from the report sent by the Venetian minister, cxviii., 45. The two are substantially the same. Montglat, 306, Mme. de Motteville, 444, also describe it, but with less fulness and accuracy. No contemporary writer attributes to Louis any such words, as "L'Etat, c' est moi." The remark is legendary and its origin considerably later. M. Vian and M. Chéruel have fully reviewed the authorities on this question, and shown that there was no evidence that Louis said any thing of the sort.

cate fear in the minds of these people, as that was the only way to compel them to their duty. All the presidents and deans of the different chambers should be summoned before the king, and any hope of their receiving permission to assemble and deliberate on the edict should be dispelled in vigorous and energetic terms.[1]

The cardinal obtained Turenne's aid in quieting the opposition of the Parliament. The marshal saw President Bellièvre, represented to him the injurious effects on the campaign that was about beginning, of opposition to the financial measures of the government, and Bellièvre promised that he would use his efforts to prevent any discussion of these matters.[2] He recognized the fact that Louis XIV. was inflexible in his resolution that he would not allow any such meeting, and at the same time the president wished to preserve his credit with the body, for being zealous in its interests. He conferred, therefore, with the most strenuous of the members. While professing eagerness in the cause, he said the government was now irritated, and would pursue those who demanded a meeting to consider the provisions of this edict. It was better to allow a few weeks to pass, during which permission for such discussions could be obtained.[3] It was decided, therefore, to postpone the matter. In the meantime the zeal of many was quieted by substantial rewards. Six thousand livres were given one president to help finish a terrace for his country house, and it was suggested to him that more might follow. Other sums were judiciously distributed among those who could be approached in this way.[4] Some arrests showed that the government could be severe as well as liberal, and that old caballers must be more cautious in what they said about the minister.[5] Some slight concessions were made,

[1] Lettres de Colbert, i., 234, April 16th

[2] Turenne, 468. Le Tellier à Mazarin, May 14th.

[3] He reported the progress he was making to the ministers of the crown. Aff. Etr. Fr., 894., 103, 106.

[4] Gourville, 517, 518. Gourville himself handled the money.

[5] Journal d'un Bourgeois, 338.

and the parliamentary opposition faded away. In the summer, Mazarin sent the President Bellièvre three hundred thousand livres to reward him for his discreet conduct in quieting the opposition of his associates.[1]

The president was singularly fortunate in this matter. He preserved the good-will of the Parliament for his apparent zeal in its behalf; he obtained the favor of the government and a great sum of money; and he has gone into history as the liberty-loving judge, who dared to plead for the interests of the state to the very face of a booted and enraged monarch.

The campaign of 1655 was successful, but it did not result in any very important advantages for the French. They captured Valenciennes, and after that, Turenne's army being now larger than Condé's, he marched through a portion of the Spanish Netherlands. The enemy could do nothing but watch their progress, and it was proposed to push on to Brussels. It was decided not to attempt so important a movement, but the young king took great pleasure in accompanying this military promenade through the enemies' country. Once Turenne nearly caught a portion of Condé's army as they were crossing a stream, where he might have captured or destroyed the most of them. But the Marquis of Castelnau was sent on to arrest their march, and some of Condé's officers, who were the marquis's friends, came under a flag of truce to have a chat with him. With the courtesy which the French nobles prided themselves on extending to their adversaries in war, he checked his troops to exchange the compliments of the season with his friends, and while he was doing this Condé's soldiers got across the stream. Turenne reported to Mazarin that the prince's troops went in such hot haste, that some of them had to swim over the stream and leave their cannon behind. The letter fell in Condé's hands, and he was so incensed that he carried on a diplomatic correspondence with Turenne, accusing him of having falsely maligned his honor and his

[1] Lettres de Colbert, I, 235.

management of the troops. Turenne thought that Condé treated a very small thing as a cause of diplomatic rage, but Mazarin said that those who were beaten had always the right to complain of the judges.[1]

After this the French captured the towns of Condé and Saint Guillain. Such victories were not of great importance. The garrison of Saint Guillain numbered little over 700 men, and on its surrender they were allowed to march out with the honors of war. A medal was, however, struck to celebrate this campaign of the armies of Louis XIV., representing a laurel with three mural crowns.[2] The king returned from the army in August and gave his attention to the fêtes and ballets in which the Court abounded during his presence. Louis was especially devoted at this time to Olympe Mancini, and courtiers said that the cardinal intended to round out his career by making his niece queen of France. But Olympe was afterwards married to a prince of the house of Savoy, and became the mother of Prince Eugene of Savoy, who took so great a part fifty years later in overthrowing the overweening power of Louis XIV.

The success of the campaign in Flanders was in danger of being more than counterbalanced by another great noble's imitating the treasonable conduct of Harcourt. The Marshal of Hocquincourt was governor of the important places of Peronne and Ham, in Picardy. He was jealous of Turenne, discontented with Mazarin, and enamored of the Duchess of Chatillon. This woman remained politically constant to Condé, and she became a recruiting sergeant of a peculiar character. The influence which she gained over great nobles, by her charms, she used to lead them to alliance with the prince. Disloyalty was the price of her love. It was discovered that under such influences Hocquincourt was willing to betray his places to Spain for

[1] Mém. de Turenne, 469–473. Aff. Etr. Fr., 896., 223.

[2] The events of this campaign are found in Mém. de Turenne; Mém. de York, 588–593. Mém. de Bussy Rabutin i., 413, *et seq.* Letters of Mazarin to the queen; Aff. Etr., 896.

a reasonable compensation. Mazarin appealed both to the marshal's love and his avarice. He had the Duchess of Chatillon arrested and put under the guard of the Abbé Fouquet, who was himself known to be a very ardent admirer. He then offered Hocquincourt a large sum of money to resign his governments. The marshal's anxiety for the welfare of the lady did not prevent his demanding a very exorbitant price. Mazarin at last bought his resignation of the governments of Peronne and Ham by paying a million two hundred thousand francs, and releasing the Duchess of Chatillon from her perilous position.[1]

France had made considerable gains since 1652 in the war in Flanders and along her northeastern boundary. Armies had also been equipped and sent to Italy and Catalonia. Though they had met with a moderate degree of success, their accomplishments had not been such as materially to change the aspect of the war or hasten its end. The Marquis of Hocquincourt commanded the army sent in 1653 to regain the lost province of Catalonia. He met with but indifferent success, and the next year the command was given the Prince of Conti, as a reward for marrying the cardinal's niece. Though Conti had none of his brother's military genius, his campaign was attended by some small victories. He saved the important place of Roses, which was nearly all that France now held beyond the Pyrenees, and he captured Villefranche.[2] More ambitious plans were made for 1655, but the result was less satisfactory. A fleet was equipped to act along the coast, in which there was one boat of two thousand tons burthen.[3] But it accomplished no more than to fight a naval battle off Barcelona, where neither side gained any advantage. Later in the year, Don John of Austria captured some places from the French, and at best, the latter could claim no progress this year in regaining Catalonia.[4]

[1] This curious affair is briefly stated in Montglat, 309–311, and more fully described in Mazarin's letters found in Aff. Etr. Fr., 896.

[2] Dis. Ven., cxvii., 177. Montglat, 303, 304.

[3] Aff. Etr. Fr., 895., 53. [4] Montglat, 312. Aff. Etr. Fr., 897., 188.

The campaigns in Italy during these years were even more unimportant. But if the French gained little there by arms, they gained much by diplomacy. The Duke of Mantua had been induced to espouse the cause of Spain, while France was suffering defeat during the Fronde. But when that country again regained its ascendancy, he once more sought its protection, and he agreed to take Casal from the Spanish and to have it garrisoned by Swiss, who should be in the pay of France. Such a measure strengthened the French position in Italy, though Mantua was a fluctuating and untrustworthy ally. A more important step was obtaining the Duke of Modena as a firm friend. Such an alliance was cemented by the marriage of his son, the Prince of Modena, in 1655, with Laura Martinozzi.[1] Marriages were contracted with the family of the cardinal as with the daughters or sisters of a king. They were used to form political alliances, and those who wedded Mazarin's nieces attached themselves to the interests of the country he governed. The Duke of Modena continued steadfast in his friendship, and he was made general of the French armies in Italy, and, in 1656, captured the important city of Valenza.

Though France had obtained considerable advantages in her contest with Spain, Mazarin had long endeavored to obtain an ally which he believed would assure the victory. He could not hope to capture the important cities of Dunkirk and Gravelines without the aid of some maritime power, for the French navy had become too weak for any such enterprise. When Holland became involved in war with England, her ambassadors endeavored to obtain from France a defensive alliance against that country. Mazarin had no thought of taking a step which would only draw upon himself the indignation of Cromwell, but he told the Dutch that the root of their troubles was in Spain, and proceeded from their error in making a separate peace at Münster. The envoys had no authority to make a treaty which would involve re-

[1] Dis. Ven., cxviii., 79. She had 2,500,000 francs for her dowry.

newing their ancient war with the Spanish, and they made no response to such overtures.[1]

But the cardinal sought with much more earnestness to obtain an alliance with his powerful neighbor across the channel. Though the wife of Charles I. was the aunt of Louis XIV., that fact had not led Mazarin to take any sentimental interest in the civil war in England. He minuted in his Carnets in 1642, that France had best take no part in the troubled affairs of that country.[2] Permission was given the queen of England to enlist some troops in France, but that slight assistance was all that she received. Still the overthrow of Charles I. and his execution naturally excited much sympathy in a sister monarchy. His queen and his sons found refuge and hospitable treatment in France, when they were obliged to fly from their own country. The French government was too much engaged with its own internal troubles to be expected to give any aid towards their restoration, but it did not recognize the new government of England. The revolution in England and the execution of Charles I. excited very different emotions among the monarchical governments in Europe, from those which were caused when France declared herself a republic in the following century. Not only was England more removed from the other European governments, but in the 17th century no fear was entertained of the spread of democracy. Holland had become a republic, but it excited no imitators, as the United States did later. The French Revolution came at a time when the most of Europe was ripe

[1] Dis. Ven., cxvi., 156, Sept., 1653. In the Negociations d'Estrades, t. i., 105, *et seq.*, is published a proposed treaty between France and the Prince of Orange in 1650, by which he was to break with Spain, and the allies were also to unite in war with England and endeavor to reëstablish the Stuarts. With this is a letter of Mazarin approving the plan, and a letter of Estrades. Though these negotiations have been related by M. Cheruel, "France sous Mazarin," ii., 350, on the faith of these documents, I am convinced that they are all apocryphal. To give my reasons would take much time and excite little interest.

[2] Carnet, i., 135, Dec. 31, 1642, "Essendo le cose ancora assai imbrogliate e dubbie del parlemento e del re."

for social change, and the old régimes of every country felt that they must unite against it for their own preservation.

Cromwell soon showed that he could not only subdue any insurrections at home, but that the republic proposed taking an active part in foreign affairs. Both Spain and France sought its alliance, and a diplomatic contest of some years followed. Whichever of these countries could obtain the active favor of Cromwell would be able to end the long war on terms that would be advantageous and honorable. Spain first decided to recognize the new government, and, in December, 1650, her ambassadors were accredited to the Parliament of the republic. This act was favorably received by the Parliament, and added to the advantage which the Spanish already possessed in the good-will of the English.

If France was to make any serious endeavor to obtain the alliance of England, it was evident that the present government must be recognized, and, in January, 1651, Mazarin presented to the council a memoir to that effect. Honor and justice, this said, required that the king should not recognize the republic, because this would be acknowledging the authority of usurpers who had stained their hands with the blood of their sovereign, and it would be abandoning the cause of his kinsman, the present king. But the laws of honor and justice should not lead to action which was contrary to the rules of prudence. The English were masters of the sea. They might join with Spain and incite the Huguenots to insurrection. It would be well, therefore, to recognize the republic, but only on the condition that some advantage should be granted France sufficient to compensate for the loss of reputation from such a step.[1]

Though the relations between the two countries were nominally those of peace, a guerrilla warfare was actually waging between them on the high seas. English merchantmen had suffered severely from the ravages of privateers,

[1] This memoir has been published in *Revue Nouvelle* and in Guizot's "Révolution d'Angleterre," t. iii.

and it was claimed that this damage had chiefly been inflicted by the French. Those who traded in the Mediterranean and with Turkey complained especially of the great losses to which they had thus been exposed, and demanded compensation.[1] The French government denied its responsibility for these outrages, and it is probable that some of these privateers were fitted out under letters of marque granted by Charles the II. But many such ships sailed under the French flag. The new republic began to assert very great authority on the sea, and the English not only demanded a large sum as compensation, but they undertook to right their wrongs by force. French ships were attacked and taken by the English as if the two countries were at war, and the capture of the fleet sailing for the relief of Dunkirk in 1652, was only the most notable of such exploits. These acts were said to be by way of reprisal, and the English superiority at sea was so great, that neither a merchantship nor a man-of-war floating the French flag felt safe out of sight of land, nor even when moored at its own harbor.

Mazarin endeavored to obtain from England, as a condition of recognizing the republic, either a treaty of alliance or, at least, a commercial treaty which should stop such injuries.[2] But the republic declined to barter for its recognition, and, in 1652, when Gravelines was in danger from the Spanish, and it could be rescued only by sea, Mazarin directed Estrades to offer Dunkirk to the English, if they would relieve Gravelines and agree to assist France in the war with Spain. He was to obtain also, if possible, two or three million livres as a condition of the cession of so important a port.[3]

[1] Bordeaux à Brienne, April 14, 1653. Aff. Etr. Ang., 62.

[2] Instruction à Gentillot, Feb., 1651 ; à Estrades, April 23, 1652.

[3] Mazarin à Estrades, April 23, 1652. In the "Ambassades d'Estrades," t. i., 103–107, is a letter from Estrades saying that an agent of Cromwell in Feb., 1652, had offered to furnish 2,000,000 in money and 50 ships and 15,000 men for the war against Spain, as a condition of the cession of Dunkirk. There is also a letter of Mazarin in reply saying he was in favor of ac-

Such negotiations were fruitless. The English were more inclined to ally themselves with Spain or to assist Condé, and to hope that they might gain Calais or La Rochelle as the result of such a policy. Mazarin decided to delay no longer in the unconditional recognition of the republic, and on December 2, 1652, Bordeaux was formally accredited as envoy of France to the new government. But the members of the Parliament were exceedingly tenacious that there should be no informality in the treatment they received from more ancient governments. Louis XIV.'s letter was addressed to his "dear and great friends" and the Parliament refused to accept it.[1] A new letter was addressed to the Parliament of the Republic of England, and the minister was thereupon formally received. The recognition of the republican government was a cause of complaint to many in France. Henriette Marie wrote that since the death of her husband she had felt nothing so much as that her kinsman should recognize those infamous traitors.[2] Many others also disapproved of the measure, but Mazarin proceeded in his endeavors to gain a powerful ally, and paid little attention to their remonstrances. He found, however, that in Cromwell he had a difficult person with whom to deal. Mazarin sent to him a personal letter of compliment, and he replied that he esteemed this a very great honor and held himself obliged to send his thanks for so singular a

cepting the offer, but Chateauneuf overruled him and induced the king to decline it. These letters are accepted as genuine by Guizot and Martin. With great respect for such eminent authorities, I am convinced that they are fictitious. Among many other reasons, Cromwell is spoken of as Protector, a year and a half before he had that title. Mazarin's answer is dated from a place where he was not at the time. Chateauneuf is stated to have controlled the council, at a time when he had been retired in disgrace. The offer was such a one as Cromwell would never have made, and the letter was such a one as Mazarin would never have written.

[1] Instructions à Bordeaux and Lettre de Louis XIV., Dec. 2, 1652. Aff. Etr. Ang., 61.

[2] Aff. Etr. Ang., 61. Letter of Henriette Marie, Dec. 15, 1652. This letter has been published in "Letters of Queen Henrietta Maria," edited by Mary Anne Green.

favor.[1] But all of Mazarin's blandishments were wasted upon the man who was now the ruler of England.

France was unpopular with the English people, and with the leaders of the Parliament. The relationship of Louis XIV. with the English queen, and the protection given to Charles II. were regarded as a constant menace to the present government.[2] Even the fact that France was controlled by a cardinal who, it was thought, must necessarily be an attached follower of the Pope, was urged as a reason against forming any alliance with that country.[3] Bordeaux began by urging the return of the ships captured at Dunkirk and elsewhere, but he met with chilly refusals. The English, the ambassador reported, were much to be feared, and it would be better to abandon any requests of this sort. They were carrying on with vigor and success a naval war against Holland, and enjoying the great consideration and influence which their country now had in the affairs of Europe. They talked only of new conquests, the minister wrote, and they treated the requests of France with very little attention. They declared that England should be the mistress of the Baltic and that the Union Jack should drive all enemies out of the Mediterranean.[4]

Though abandoning any hope of obtaining redress for the ships that had been taken, Bordeaux prosecuted his endeavors to obtain some treaty between the two countries. The English merchants wished to be free from any further injury to their commerce, and the most of them cared more for that than for their claims for past damages.[5] It was urged that the interests of both nations would be advanced by a speedy settlement of their troubles, but the English generals told Bordeaux they should not make a treaty simply for the interest of some merchants, but only upon more important and far-reaching considerations.

[1] Letter, Jan. 26, 1653. Aff. Etr. Ang., 61. This and many of the letters of Bordeaux are published in Cosnac's "Souvenirs de Louis XIV."

[2] Bordeaux à Brienne, Feb. 10, 1653. [3] Pott à Mazarin, April 27, 1654.

[4] Bordeaux à Brienne, March 3, 6, 1653, *et passim*, Aff. Etr. Ang., 62.

[5] *Ib.*, April 14, July 7th, *et pas.*

It had been a part of the conditions granted at the request of the Parliament of Paris in 1648, that the importation of English woollen and silk stuffs into France should be forbidden. England retaliated by measures against French wools, silks, and wines. The English desired the abolition of these pernicious regulations, and they wished to know if that would be included in the treaty that was proposed.[1] Cromwell had not yet decided whether he would incline the balance in favor of Spain or France, and he procrastinated in a manner that made it impossible to discover his desires. The forms of language which he adopted added to the obscurity that veiled his conduct. Mazarin sent in June, 1653, another personal letter expressed in the fluent flattery of which he was a master. The reply of the head of the English nation contrasts curiously with the cardinal's style. "It is surprise to me that your Eminency should take notice of a person so inconsiderable as myself, living (as it were) separate from the world. This honor has done (as it ought) a very deep impression upon me, and does oblige me to serve your Eminency upon all occasions, so as I shall be happy to find out. So I trust that very honorable person, Monsieur Burdoe, will therein be helpful to your Eminencies' thrice humble servant. O. CROMWELL."[2]

His interviews with the French minister furnished little more light on his views, than was found in his correspondence. Bordeaux said that the king of France was much inclined to an accommodation between the two nations. "A just war is better than an unjust peace," replied Cromwell. The minister then expressed his thanks that no aid had been given the rebels in France, but his only answer was, that the English were busy with other affairs, and that the Spanish had been expected to furnish this assistance.[3]

---

[1] *Ib.*, March 20th and April 10th.

[2] This letter is found among the Archives des Affaires Etrangères. It has been published by Guizot in the appendices to his "Histoire de la Révolution d'Angleterre."

[3] Bordeaux, à Brienne, Aug. 7, 1653.

The French government endeavored to bring England to make some terms by suggesting that France might ally herself with Holland, but the threat did not excite fear.[1] Bordeaux was himself apprehensive that if the English obtained from Holland the terms they desired, they would be still more difficult to deal with, and the French made great but unsuccessful endeavors to be included in the treaty between those countries. The success of that war made Cromwell still more independent in his action. Bordeaux wrote that the English republic assumed a greater superiority than any prince had ever pretended to, and claimed the sovereignty of the sea as its patrimony.[2]

As the power of Cromwell increased, Spain and France became more eager in their endeavors to gain his help. The Spanish offered to pay over three million francs a year for his assistance, and this filled Mazarin with indignation. "They offer it," he wrote, "without having a sou to pay with, if he should take them at their word."[3] Notwithstanding their impecuniosity, the prospect seemed very strong that Cromwell would choose them for his allies. This proposition was discussed before the Spanish council, and difficulty was apprehended in making the payments, which would be an essential condition, as it was known that the English were very exact and very greedy. But such an alliance was regarded as the plank of safety for the Spanish monarchy, amid the perils with which it was surrounded, and it was decided that every effort should be made to obtain it.[4]

Still Cromwell delayed any final action, and waited to see by what alliance the interests and the ambition of England could be most advanced. Mazarin offered first 1,200,000 and then 1,800,000 livres a year, if Cromwell would declare war against Spain. The French would also assist him in the capture of Dunkirk, which should belong to England, and all other conquests made by the allies jointly should

[1] Memoir from Bordeaux, July 10th.
[2] Letter of December 6, 1653.
[3] Mazarin à Bordeaux, April 18, 1654.
[4] Minutes of Council of April 14th, printed by Guizot.

be equally divided.[1] These terms were as good as those which Cromwell finally obtained, but he did not accept them for the present. The result of the siege of Arras was waited for, and the Protector was not yet ready to involve himself in another foreign war.

The French grew weary of such delays, and these were aggravated by the treatment which they received from their neighbors. One of the French envoys formed the mistaken opinion that Cromwell's power could be easily overthrown, and became identified with those who were constantly engaged in laying fruitless plots against the Protector. He was accused of being implicated in some plot to murder Cromwell, and sent at once out of the country. Mazarin said it was hard to be called assassins and to bear such affronts, but his desire was still to avoid recalling the minister at London and so escape any diplomatic rupture.[2] The English continued capturing French ships on various pretexts, or on no pretexts, but Mazarin was loath to order reprisals. The merchants offered to pay the expenses of sixty good vessels to check these piratical enterprises of the English, but the French council gave no answer to the proposition, lest it might cause an open rupture.[3] The countries might have been regarded as at war now, but Mazarin was resolved to say they were at peace, whatever the English did. Even if there was a rupture, he said, so long as the English contented themselves with hostilities on the sea, it would be best to claim this was only what had been done before, and not make any clamor about it.[4] The Venetian ambassador said France treated England not only with respect, but almost with servility.[5]

The negotiations for a treaty continued during all the year 1654, but it was impossible to ascertain what decision Cromwell would make. Mazarin said the Protector's

[1] Mazarin à Boas, March 27, 1654. Instructions à Bordeaux, July 16th.

[2] Aff. Etr. Fr., 893., 31. [3] Dis. Ven., cxvii, 318, 334, 360, *et seq.*

[4] Mazarin à Servien, July 3, 1654. Aff. Etr. Fr., 893.

[5] Dis. Ven., cxviii, 33, "non solo con rispetto, ma con una spezie di servitu."

conduct was so involved, that there was no certainty of a treaty until it was signed, and the ambassador admitted that he could not penetrate his thoughts.[1] The terms that he demanded were such, that even Mazarin was unwilling to comply with all of them. It was asked that some strong place should at once be placed in the possession of England to guarantee the execution of the treaty, and that the Protector should have the right to see that the edicts in favor of the Huguenots were scrupulously executed. But the cardinal would not allow Cromwell, in his zeal to become the head and protector of all the Protestants of Europe, to constitute himself the special guardian of those of France. He replied that the Huguenots were well treated and contented, and were among the most faithful and zealous of the king's subjects.[2]

But on another point Cromwell was more tenacious and more successful. The presence of the Stuarts in France made that country an object of suspicion to his followers, and he insisted that they should be expelled. Bordeaux's instructions told him that it would be a sort of disgrace that a sovereign could not offer a retreat to his unfortunate kinsmen, but at the same time it was not worth while to lose the alliance of England against Spain for a matter of hospitality.[3] Charles the Second was accordingly required to leave France, but Cromwell consented that the Duke of York might remain in the French service if he was transferred to the army in Italy.[4] A question of precedence still remained, but on that Cromwell yielded. Mazarin wrote that if he would take the title of king he should be treated as possessing equal dignity with the king of France, but it could not be done while he did not bear the same rank.[5]

But still the treaty was not signed, though events were pushing Cromwell towards an alliance with France.

[1] Letter of Bordeaux, May 26, 1653. [2] Mazarin à Bordeaux, July 20, 1654.

[3] Instructions pour Bordeaux, Aug. 24th.

[4] Charles left France more than a year before the execution of the treaty with Cromwell, but his departure was requested on account of Cromwell's complaints. Dis. Ven., cxvii., 132. [5] Mazarin à Bordeaux, Jan. 15, 1655.

Condé still endeavored to obtain his aid. He wrote the Protector that he deemed the people of the three kingdoms most happy, because they were under the charge of so great a man, and that England's safety and repose were due to his merit and virtue.[1] But Cromwell was not won by flattery, and he said that Condé was a babbler and a rattlehead, who was betrayed by his own friends. Late in 1654 an expedition left England which was thought to be intended against some of the Spanish colonies, but governments were not quick to imagine offence against England under Cromwell, and Spain increased her endeavors for an alliance. Cromwell, however, had at last decided that more could be conquered from Spain than from France, but his final action was again delayed by the massacre of the Vaudois.

This little people of dissenters had long been tolerated in the dominions of the Duke of Savoy, and their persecution was one of the last acts of religious bigotry. In January, 1655, the inhabitants of most of their communes were ordered by the Duke of Savoy to leave within three days on pain of death, and to sell the property they owned in them within twenty days. While they remonstrated against so rigorous a measure, some troops entered their territory to enforce it, and soon passed from severity to violence. During eight days these unhappy people were subjected to every variety of the most hideous and brutal outrage—to robbery, torture, rape, and murder. This act was at first hailed by some, as one that had given great lustre to religion.[2] The duke approved of this slaughter, and asked Louis XIV. to prevent his Huguenot subjects from sending money or men to the assistance of their persecuted brethren. Such an act was distasteful to

[1] Condé à Cromwell, Dec., 1653.

[2] Dis. Ven., cxviii., 70. "3,000 heretics have been slain by fire and sword," he writes, "and 200 children taken from their parents to be reared in the Catholic faith." "Questa attione ha dato gran lustro alla religione." It should be said that Sangredo, who was then the ambassador from Venice to France, seems to have been the most stupid and wrong-headed of all her representatives there.

Mazarin's tolerant views, and he did not approve of it, though probably he was little disturbed by it.[1]

But the Vaudois found a protector powerful enough to frighten their persecutors. If Cromwell desired to be regarded as the defender of the faith, he was willing to exercise the duties of the office. His remonstrances were at once presented to the Court of Savoy in a manner so decided that they compelled attention. A regiment of French had been among the soldiers acting under Savoy's orders, who had been employed in these atrocities. The Protector wrote Louis, saying that he trusted this had been without his approval, and asking that the influence of France with Savoy should be used in behalf of the persecuted Vaudois. It was intimated to Bordeaux that no treaty would be signed with France, until she had exerted all her power with the Duke of Savoy to obtain for the Vaudois the rights of which they had been deprived.[2] Such a suggestion quickened Mazarin's zeal for toleration. The Duke of Savoy was informed that he must abandon his position at once, and cease the persecution of his subjects. He had no alternative but to obey, and in August, 1655, most of the ancient privileges of the Vaudois were restored, and their duke was obliged to discontinue pillaging and murdering them. Even those who at first approved his acts had decided that after tolerating the Vaudois so long Savoy had better wait for a better opportunity before beginning any persecutions.[3] Those who bore no love to England confessed that she was now the most feared and the most conspicuous government in the world, and that almost all of Europe was suing for her alliance.[4] She held no such position at any other period between the death of Elizabeth and the accession of William, and her influence was as great under Cromwell as it was contemptible under the Stuarts.

---

[1] Dis. Ven., cxviii., 81, 87.

[2] Bordeaux à Brienne, May 27th, August 26th, *et passim.*

[3] Dis. Ven., cxviii., 86.

[4] *Ibid.*, 103. "La corte d'Inghilterra e la piu temuta e la piu conspicua del mondo."

On November 3, 1655, the treaty of Westminster between France and England was at last signed, and Spain lost her only hope of success. These long negotiations well illustrate Mazarin's character. He showed much humility and some lack of dignity in his endeavors to obtain Cromwell's alliance. He was resolved he would take no offence at what England did; he abandoned the Stuarts; when he was smitten on one cheek he turned the other to the smiter, but at last he obtained what he desired, and that which he desired was what France needed. If Mazarin had been punctilious and eager to take offence, his historical pose would at times seem more heroic, but he might have driven England into a Spanish alliance, and the great war which forever established France's superiority might have been ended with disaster and disgrace, with Calais ceded to England, Alsace to Spain, and Guienne to the Prince of Condé as an independent sovereign.

The treaty that was signed provided for no alliance against Spain, and did little more than regulate the commercial relations of the countries. It declared that all reprisals and letters of marque should cease; commissioners should decide upon the losses that had already been sustained; in the future vessels of either country could enter the ports of the other, and various restrictions on trade were removed. Neither nation should give any aid to rebels or enemies of the other, and certain persons were to be expelled from the respective territories, among whom were Charles, eldest son of the late king, and his brothers.[1] The friends of the Stuarts complained of this alliance with a usurper, and some of the clergy protested against a treaty with heretics, lest it might be prejudicial to the cause of religion, but the Duke of York himself admitted that Mazarin would have been an unfaithful servant of the crown, if he had omitted to secure Cromwell in the interests of France.[2]

[1] Dumont, Corps Dip., vi., 121–3. The article about those who were to be exiled was secret. Charles had already been asked to retire and had left France.

[2] Dis. Ven., cxix., 3. Mém. de York, 594.

Immediately after the ratification of the peace of Westminster, war was formally declared between England and Spain, and Cromwell was then ready to proceed further and make an alliance with France. But Mazarin had already obtained what was of most importance. England was at war with Spain, and she had ceased to harass France on the sea. He wished, before committing himself further, to see if a satisfactory peace with Spain could not now be made. Cromwell desired to send Lockhart as ambassador to the French Court, but Mazarin anticipated that with the feeling that then existed his presence might be embarrassing. He instructed Bordeaux, if possible, to dissuade the Protector from sending any representative to France, but the minister was unsuccessful in his efforts.[1] Ladies ran away to hide themselves when they heard that an ambassador from the regicides and republicans of England was to be at the Court. It was feared that there might be some disturbance if he was publicly received at Paris; but Lockhart arrived, was courteously treated by the government, and escaped all manifestations of dislike from any quarter.[2]

When it was known that the treaty of Westminster had been made, and when England had declared war, the archduke advised Philip IV. that it was hopeless for Spain to contend against France, England, and Portugal, and that he had best make terms without delay.[3] That monarch was himself a silent and apparently unconcerned observer of the decline of the empire which he ruled. It was said that for weeks he did not speak a word and laughter was unknown to him. Such taciturnity did not indicate any profound meditations. Philip hunted much; he listened to music and looked at pictures somwhat, and he heard of the loss of cities and provinces in silence and apathy.

His chief minister Don Luis de Haro still hoped for the turn of fortune which was so slow in coming, but a secret

[1] Mazarin à Bordeaux, April 26, 1656. Bordeaux à Brienne, May 1st, *et seq.* [2] Dis. Ven., cxix., 52–55. Montpensier, iii., 283.

[3] Instructions of Feb'y 8, 1656, published by Valfrey.

messenger now intimated a desire for a conference to see if peace could not be made. Lionne was sent to Madrid with much secrecy in the summer of 1656, and he began negotiations with Haro for peace between the two countries. After much haggling, during which the French envoy several times packed his saddle bags and declared he would leave the next morning, it was at last agreed that Roussillon, Arras, and a large portion of Artois should be ceded to France, and with that Lionne was content. But the diplomats were unable to agree concerning the interests of the Prince of Condé. Mazarin was willing that he should have his estates and titles, but he refused to restore the governments and offices which had helped to render Condé so powerful, and with which he could begin a new rebellion.[1] The prince demanded these, and the Spanish ministers supported his demands in a manner that spoke much for their chivalry and little for their judgment. The Spanish council declared that this was a matter of honor, and on such a question the king was justified in risking and even in losing all of his states.[2] Lionne hinted at a marriage of Louis XIV. with the Infanta as a solution for some of these difficulties, but the Spanish did not wish to incur the possibility that such an alliance might result in the king of France becoming also the king of Spain, and the negotiations were broken off.[3]

The campaign of 1656 was also unfortunate, and its reverses made the Spanish more resolute in the terms on which they insisted. The French, under the command of Turenne, laid siege to Valenciennes, one of the strongest and most important cities in the Spanish Low Countries. Its garrison consisted of fifteen hundred men, who were aided by the efforts of the citizens, while Condé led twenty thousand men near Turenne's encampment, in the hope of raising the siege. An opportunity was fur-

[1] Mazarin à Bordeaux, Nov. 19, 1656.

[2] Rapport de Lionne, Sept. 23, 1656. Aff. Etr. Spain, 32.

[3] The letters and documents in reference to this negotiation are published in "Ambassades de Lionne en Espagne" and in "Negociations relatives à la Succession d'Espagne," t. i.

nished him, for La Ferté Seneterre was sent to command a portion of the army. Seneterre had served under Condé, and the prince knew his rashness and inefficiency. Condé attacked the lines during the night of July 15th, in the portion where Seneterre was in command, found them ill guarded, and inflicted a crushing defeat on that division of the army. Turenne could do nothing for their relief, but Seneterre did the best he could for the service by managing to be taken prisoner. The siege was raised, and Turenne, after the severe loss the army had suffered, was in a condition of some peril. His troops were so demoralized by the disastrous effects of this nocturnal attack, that a hare running through the camp on the following night excited an alarm and caused such consternation, that had the Spanish attacked them they might have gained an easy victory.[1] They did not do so, and almost the only advantage they derived from their success was the capture of the town of Condé.[2]

During this year troubles again rose between the king and the Parliament. The cavalier treatment which the body received in 1655 did not destroy all spirit of resistance, and the position on which it next took its stand compelled the government to make some concessions. The finances were becoming more involved, and among other devices for new taxation, the government resorted to the worst of all, and in January, 1656, issued a decree depreciating the coinage. The Parliament remonstrated, and expressed the opposition of merchants and citizens to so pernicious a measure. The king insisted that the regulation of the currency was a matter wholly out of their jurisdiction. The members persisted in their resolve to discuss the matter, and thereupon five of them were at once ordered to retire from Paris. The Parliaments of Toulouse and Grenoble joined in similar protestations, and declared that the new pieces should not be current in their districts.

[1] Mém. de Bussy Rabutin, ii., 14. Rabutin served under Turenne in this campaign, and until the end of the war.

[2] Bussy Rabutin, ii., 9–24. Turenne, 475–482. Dis. Ven., cxix., 80, 101, *et pas.*

Against such protests, the government yielded in part, and modified the decree so far as it concerned silver, but the Parliament remonstrated against what still remained. It declared the edict of the council of state annulled, and thereupon seven more members were banished and the advocate-general was thrown into the Bastille. The new gold pieces were issued, but difficulties grew out of their circulation, and the burden of all these new and old impositions stirred up bad feeling, if not actual outbreaks, in many of the provinces. The Parliament had now suspended its sessions for the administration of justice, and in addition to such embarrassment, the assembly of the clergy was full of complaints, and refused to vote what the government demanded. Even that sum was far less than the burden, which should have fallen upon the enormous estates of the church, had they been taxed in the same proportion as other property in the kingdon. Terms were at last made with the judges. Those imprisoned or banished were returned to their body, the right of the Parliament to take cognizance over any change of monies was recognized, the judges promised that in the future they would submit themselves kindly to the royal desires, and they began again the administration of justice.[1]

After the poor success of this year, Mazarin was quite willing to consider a more intimate treaty of alliance with Cromwell. Delay was caused, because Mazarin would not involve France in schemes so large as those which attracted the Protector, but a treaty was signed on March 23, 1657, by which the two nations formed an alliance for one year. Gravelines, Mardyke, and Dunkirk were to be besieged successively, the English furnishing a fleet and France twenty thousand men. England was also to furnish six thousand soldiers on land, but they were to be paid by the French. Dunkirk and Mardyke were to be given to the English for their assistance, and Gravelines was to belong to France.

[1] The only account of these transactions of which I am aware is found in the despatches of the Venetian ambassador, t. cxviii, 257, *et pas.* ; cxix., 13, 22, 24, 30, *et pas.*

CHAPTER XVII.

PEACE OF THE PYRENEES AND DEATH OF MAZARIN.

THE beginning of the campaign was unfavorable for the new allies. The English troops did not arrive until late in May, and when the army was at last in the field it was unsuccessful. The French endeavored to capture Cambrai, but Condé succeeded by great promptness and skill in throwing reinforcements into the place, and Turenne was obliged to abandon the siege. Seneterre then invested Montmedi, but it was nearly two months before the place surrendered. The Spanish in the meantime undertook an expedition in the hope of surprising Calais, but they came too late and the enterprise resulted in nothing. They then marched back and failed in an attempt to raise the siege of Saint Venant, and after that themselves began the siege of Ardres. Turenne now captured Saint Venant and compelled the Spanish to raise the siege of Ardres.

The marshal's success after the campaign was fairly opened was greatly assisted by the inefficiency of the generals opposed to him. The command of the Spanish army had been given to Don John of Austria, in whom some natural ability had been destroyed by the training he had received as a son of the king of Spain. He observed the same formalities in the field and yielded to the same slothfulness, as when he was holding his Court at Brussels. His domestics dared not rouse him, even when something in the enemy's movements required immediate attention. As soon as camp had been reached he went at once to bed, took his supper there, and paid no atten-

tion to the army until the next morning. The officers could with difficulty have access to him, yet they were allowed to do nothing without positive orders.[1]

But capturing towns in the interior was not the programme that had been agreed on with Cromwell, and the Protector soon began vigorous complaints. The English soldiers grumbled at their rations, and specimens of the bread they received were sent to England, to show the difference between it and the good bread to which they were accustomed in their own country.[2] There were the ordinary irregularities in the payment of the troops, and the English became so impatient that Turenne had his silver plate of the value of thirty thousand livres cut up, and used it for their payment.[3] But the chief grievance was that neither Mardyke nor Dunkirk were attacked, but the English recruits were used for the capture of places which were for the advantage of France alone. Mazarin was, perhaps, not eager to carry out his part of the agreement, or to devote his energies to capturing the important city of Dunkirk in order to put it in the possession of England. The young king was taken down to review the Ironsides whom Cromwell had sent over, and the cardinal despatched flattering letters to the Protector, and still the sieges were not begun as had been agreed. But Mazarin had to deal with an ally who was not to be paid with compliments. However obscure the phraseology in which Cromwell often saw fit to veil his thoughts, he found no difficulty, when he desired, in expressing them with the utmost clearness. He wrote on August 31st that he was amazed to find the French were not sincere in the treaty they had made. To suggest giving England some place in the interior, or to say what they would do in the next campaign, was talk for children. If they wanted to give possession of some place until Dunkirk was captured, they could give him Calais or Boulogne, or they could indemnify him for the expense he had been at, and he would take his

[1] Mém. de York, 598–600. [2] Bordeaux à Brienne, Aug. 25, 1657.
[3] Voyage à Paris, 252.

troops and employ them where they would be of more use for England.

Mazarin was sagacious enough to see that there could be no more trifling. Dunkirk and Gravelines had been so fortified that Turenne thought it was impracticable to attack them this year, but in September he laid siege to Mardyke. With the aid of the fleet the city was captured without much difficulty, and it was turned over to the English in conformity with the terms of the treaty.[1] Fresh complaints were raised in France when this place was actually put in the possession of a rival and heretical nation, but Mazarin said those who talked thus were fools, knaves, and bigots.[2]

The treaty with England had been made only for a year, and neither Dunkirk nor Gravelines had been captured. But the allies were again on amicable terms, and in the spring of 1658 it was renewed for another year on substantially the same terms. It was provided that Dunkirk should be attacked at once, and though the weather was bad and much of the country flooded, in May Turenne began the siege of the place. The great strength of the position and the nature of the surroundings made its capture a difficult task. Bridges had to be built to allow the different parts of the army to communicate, and stockades in order to ward off to some extent the attacks of the sea. Towards the dunes or shifting hills and stretches of sand, no entrenchments could be made that would be sufficient to repel an attempt to break the lines.

But the Spanish had left only eighteen hundred men for the garrison of the place, and they abandoned the defence of the only dyke which could be traversed through the expanse of waters that surrounded the city. Turenne was thus enabled to reach Dunkirk, and there he proceeded with his entrenchments as well as the nature of the country permitted. The Spanish army under Don John approached

[1] The campaign of 1657 is described in Mém. de Turenne, 482–9; York, 595–601. Lettres de Turenne à Le Tellier and Mazarin. Dis Ven, cxx., 104, 118, *et pas.*

[2] Mazarin à Lionne, Jan. 11, 1658.

in order to make some endeavor to save the place, but it was commanded with more than the usual carelessness and inattention. Don John decided to march over the dunes and encamp close to the French army. The artillery had not arrived, there were no implements to raise entrenchments, and there was an insufficient supply of powder. He was told that Turenne would attack him, but with the usual Spanish complacency he replied that that was precisely what he desired.

Turenne at once decided on that course, which was also strongly advocated by Mazarin.[1] The marshal gave his orders to his associates, and he told Lockhart, who commanded the six thousand English, that he would explain his reasons for the step he had decided upon. Lockhart told him that orders were sufficient; he could give his reasons when the battle was over. At four on the morning of June 14th the army marched from its entrenchments against the Spanish forces. Don John had done nothing to prepare for a serious battle, and four thousand of his cavalry were off foraging. Condé asked the Duke of Gloucester if he had ever seen a battle fought, and the duke replied that he had not. "In half an hour," said the prince, "you will see how we shall lose one." The Spanish troops had an advantage in their position upon the hills, the ascent of which over the loose sand was difficult for the enemy. The battle was fought on the very edge of the ocean, and the English ships were able to throw a few balls into the Spanish army. The attack was led with much fury. Lockhart commanded the English regiments at the left, next to the ocean, and his soldiers distinguished themselves by their valor.[2] Among those opposed to them were the English and Irish regiments of Charles II., who was now an ally of Spain. Lockhart's soldiers, after a sharp encounter, put their adversaries to flight. At the other wing Condé sustained a battle lost in advance, with the utmost courage and skill. But he

[1] Mazarin à Talon, June 14, 15, 1658. Aff. Etr., Pays Bas., 45.

[2] They were led in their charge on the dunes by General Morgan.

was unable to check the advance of the French forces; the Spanish broke in confusion, and Turenne's victory was complete. Don John lost about a thousand killed and wounded and four thousand prisoners.[1]

The result of the battle of the Dunes showed how much greater was the value of a victory in the field, than the capture of two or three towns by siege, which was generally the employment of a campaign. The rescue of Dunkirk was now hopeless. Its valiant commander, the Marquis of Leyde, was killed, and on June 25th the city surrendered. It was put in the possession of the English, and they continued to hold it until it was sold to the French by Charles II., shortly after his restoration. The return of the Stuarts saved France from the danger of leaving a place almost as important as Calais in the possession of England, and the advantages which Cromwell had exacted were frittered away by Charles.

Turenne continued a campaign of unbroken success. The Spanish could do nothing but strengthen the garrisons of some places, and pray for the winter to come and compel the French army to retire. Turenne laid siege to the important city of Gravelines, and the English fleet assisted him. The city surrendered on August 27th, and this conquest the French kept for themselves. Some troops of the Prince of Ligne were attacked near Menin and cut to pieces. Turenne captured Oudenarde, Menin, and Ypres; he was within a few hours' march of Brussels, and he believed that he could capture the city, but decided that it would be more prudent not to make the attempt.[2] The marshal continued the campaign until late in the winter, and it was more disastrous for the Spanish in the Low Countries than any other of a war that had lasted twenty-four years.[3]

---

[1] For the battle of the Dunes see Turenne, 494, 495. York, 604–609. Bussy Rabutin, ii., 52–67. Coligny Saligny, 57 *et seq.* Dis. Ven., cxxi., 78 *et seq.*

[2] Turenne à Mazarin, Sept. 13th.

[3] The campaign of 1658 is described in Mém. de Turenne, 489–508. York 600–612. Bussy Rabutin, ii., 52, *et seq.* Letters of Turenne and Talon to Le Tellier and Mazarin, 1658.

This year witnessed another of the treasons which were so frequent among officers in charge of important positions. The commanders at Hesdin, a strong place in Artois, induced the garrison to revolt, allied themselves with Spain and held the place against the French king. Efforts were made to agree on terms with them, but without success. Mazarin followed Richelieu's precepts in many things, but not in all; unlike his predecessor he always bought traitors, instead of beheading them. Richelieu during these years would have sent a few colonels and marquises, and possibly even a marshal or a duke, to the block, and the governors of provinces and fortresses would have ceased to meditate on betraying them to Spain.

The Marshal of Hocquincourt, who had recently extorted an enormous sum of money lest he should betray Ham and Peronne to Spain, now endeavored to stir up insurrection in Normandy, and failing in this he sought to be received as governor in Hesdin. This also was refused, and he thereupon joined the Spanish army. His career of treason was soon ended, and he was killed in a skirmish just before the battle of the Dunes.[1]

The more important events of these years did not prevent some interest in the conduct of a woman, whose position and eccentricities have gained for her a certain fame. Gustavus Adolphus had no son, and his crown was inherited by his daughter Christine, who was but six at his death. The government of Sweden was administered by a council, controlled by Chancellor Oxenstiern, and it was not until 1644, when the young Christine had reached eighteen, that she herself began to rule. She was governed at first by judicious counsellors, and the Peace of Westphalia added both to the reputation and the territory of Sweden. The queen herself introduced some judicious reforms in the kingdom, and in her zeal for letters, she organized

[1] For the conduct of these predecessors of Benedict Arnold, see Bussy Rabutin, ii., 54. Dis. Ven., cxxi., 18, 30, 44, *et pas.* The ambassador says, the policy of sweetness which was always adopted was prejudicial to the interests of the crown, and that Hocquincourt's death was "meritato castigo alla di lui fellonia." See also Mém. de York, 603, 604.

literary institutions and collected libraries and objects of art. Men of learning were invited to her Court, much after the fashion which was adopted later by Frederick the Second. The most illustrious of these visitors was Descartes, with whom she wished to study philosophy every morning at five o'clock. She is said to have desired also that he should dance in some royal ballet. The philosopher declined the ballet, and found the attainments of his pupil somewhat superficial. The eccentricities and the vices of her character rapidly developed, and her subjects began to weary of the daughter of their great king. She was in many things masculine. Her body was hardy and powerful and she had early habituated it to hunting, riding, and violent exercise. Her voice was harsh and deep, she chose men exclusively for her companions, and assumed to despise those of her own sex. Her dress was more like that of a man than a woman, though it bore little resemblance to the costume of either sex. Her subjects desired her to marry, but she announced that she could not reconcile herself to the idea of matrimony. She selected her cousin, Charles Gustavus, for her successor, and to discourage princes who sued for her hand, she formally assumed the title of king.

But this aversion to matrimony unfortunately did not prevent her having very questionable relations with some of her favorites, and leading a life which was distasteful to the strict views and rigid morality of her subjects. The ministers whom she chose wasted the public funds and excited general discontent. The nation was weary of her rule and she was weary of ruling, and in 1654 she abdicated the throne, and Charles Gustavus became king of Sweden.

She then began her career as a wanderer over Europe. She was attended by a little Court, composed mostly of foreigners of very low character. But she had a reputation for profound and universal learning, and the fame of this increased the curiosity which her career and her abdication excited in Europe. She had read many books, was

familiar with several languages, had a tenacious memory, and possessed a considerable amount of miscellaneous information, which was perhaps extraordinary in a monarch, but would have been very superficial in a subject. Immediately after abandoning her crown she also abandoned her religion, and professed her belief in the Catholic church. She went to Rome. Alexander VII. attached a very undue importance to this triumph of the faith, and she was solemnly baptized by him with the name of Alexandra in honor of her favorite hero, Alexander the Great. Leaving Rome, in the autumn of 1656 she visited France. By an appropriate choice, the Duke of Guise, whose character was as bizarre as her own, was sent to receive her when she entered the kingdom. At the Court she was treated as a sovereign, and the peculiarities of her conduct excited the liveliest wonder. She wore a head-dress which was like the peruke of a man in front and the coiffure of a woman in the rear. At times, she carried a sword by her side. Her face was always extremely powdered, and her hands were usually extremely dirty.

The courtiers crowded about this curious personage, and vast throngs endeavored to catch sight of her when she rode about the city. She attended the Italian comedy and pronounced it very bad, but at the French comedy she showed the emotions of the ideal theatre-goer. When they recited their jokes, her laughter filled the house, while at the scenes of pathos and sorrow she sobbed and wept aloud. She sang to herself in company, she seated herself on one chair and put her feet over another in the presence of Louis XIV., and she danced at a ball in a manner which was the most curious and amusing of all her performances. Such conduct might have been forgiven in a queen, but she added the more serious vice of meddling. She advised the king about his marriage and the cardinal about making peace with Spain, and her royal entertainers were much relieved when she returned to Italy.

In 1657 she visited France again, but she was ordered to remain at Fontainebleau. She occupied the royal palace

there, and she stained it by a crime which showed that the frivolity of her character was accompanied by equal ferocity. Her little court consisted almost entirely of men, and their tawdry dress and tarnished reputations corresponded to the character of their sovereign. Among them was a so-called Count of Monaldeschi and one Santinelli, who were rivals for the affection of Christine. Santinelli was now the favorite, and to destroy him his rival devised some letters which were sent the queen, coming nominally from outside parties, and showing that Santinelli had revealed matters concerning her of the most private and secret character. But Santinelli cleared himself, and the letters were traced to Monaldeschi. He was called before Christine and compelled to confess what he had done. This wandering ex-sovereign professed to treat his acts as high treason against her Majesty, and she ordered that the offender should prepare for death within an hour. He begged to have at least the night in which to make his peace with his God, but this was refused. The wretched man seems to have been unable to make any defence. Santinelli and some of his followers attacked him with their swords. He asked to have a confessor. One was brought from the palace, and they waited until he had received the confession of the unfortunate man. The confessor saw the queen and begged her to stop the murder, but without effect. As soon as the sacrament was administered, the murderers at once resumed their work, and butchered Monaldeschi in the gallery des cerfs. His remains were immediately buried.

Such a brutal murder, performed in a royal palace, under the pretence of the authority over her court, that was claimed by this wandering madwoman, filled the king and the community with horror. But much was then forgiven to royal blood. Louis XIV. visited Christine again, and she claimed to have had sufficient cause for ordering the punishment which had been inflicted. The next year she was so persistent in her desire, that she was at last allowed to join the Court. Her reputation as a murderess

did not make her so unwelcome, as her character as a bore. She entered the rooms of the king or the cardinal, and kept them up most of the night by her talking, until Mazarin claimed to have the gout in order to be rid of her. She attended a session of the members of the French Academy, but she viewed them with the ill-will of a rival savant. She pronounced them men having only the appearance of learning, with none of the real meat of wisdom. In March, 1658, she left France to the relief both of the Court and the literati, and she did not again return.[1]

Amid the successes which France enjoyed, Mazarin had for some time feared that the Emperor would be persuaded to lend aid to the Spanish. By the treaty of Westphalia he had agreed to take no further part in the struggle, but close relationship, similar views, and long political associations between Spain and Austria, operated against a strict compliance with this provision. In 1656 the imperial troops were in Italy, engaged against the Duke of Modena, and the French ministers declared that the Emperor had already repeatedly violated the terms of the Peace of Westphalia.[2] Amidst her adversities, Spain hoped that Ferdinand III. would come to the rescue of a branch of the House of Austria. The political position was still more complicated by the wars excited by the ambition of Charles Gustavus, between Sweden, Denmark, Poland, and other northern powers, which might involve all Germany.

But in April, 1657, Ferdinand III. died and left the succession to the Empire open. The rulers of Austria had usually guarded against any danger of change in the imperial succession, by having their eldest son elected king of the Romans. Upon the death of the Emperor the king of the Romans had an indisputable title to succeed to his

[1] Full accounts of the career of this eccentric woman in France are found in Journal d'un Voyage à Paris, 321–339, 428, 438, *et pas.* Mém. de Motteville, 448–453. Dis. Ven., cxvii., 161, 162, *et pas.*

[2] Dis. Ven., cxix., 131 *et pas.*, giving conversations with Servien.

office. The eldest son of Ferdinand III. had been thus chosen, but he died before his father, and before the Emperor could obtain the election of his second son he himself died. His heir was a boy of only seventeen, and there seemed to be an unusually favorable opportunity for wresting the Empire from the House of Austria. Mazarin resolved to make the effort. Now, he wrote, was the opportunity for the electors to show Europe that the imperial dignity was not the patrimony of one family, which the council of Spain could control at its will.[1]

The cardinal was somewhat embarrassed in finding a candidate to bring forward against the young Leopold of Austria. If it had been possible, he would have preferred to obtain the dignity for Louis XIV. He wrote Servien in 1654 that he did not see why Louis XIV. could not think of this dignity for himself, and a million well employed might give a great impulse to the affair.[2] If there was any prospect for the election of the king, he wrote during the congress, the purse of France would be freely opened.[3] Pamphlets were issued, showing the wisdom of choosing Louis XIV. for this office, and they were circulated at the congress of electors, to see if the current could not be turned that way. But there was never any thought in the electoral college of the king of France as a serious candidate, and Mazarin, recognizing this, gave but little attention to the matter.[4]

It was hoped, however, that it might be possible to obtain the election of the Duke of Neuburg, or of the Elector of Bavaria, and Lionne and the Duke of Gramont were sent as the representatives of France to the congress, to obtain the choice of one of these, or if that endeavor

[1] Aff. Etr. All., 136. Instructions, etc., July, 1657. Many of the letters on this subject have been published by M. Valfrey, Ambassades de Hugues de Lionne.

[2] Aff. Etr. Fr., 893., 172.

[3] Aff. Etr. Fr., 272., 132. See also Memoir, July 29, 1657, Aff. Etr. All., 140. In this, Mazarin says Louis would prefer that Bavaria or Neuburg should be chosen, and his name would be brought forward only on the advice of his friends.

[4] The candidacy of Louis XIV. is rarely spoken of in Mazarin's letters and instructions to his representatives.

failed, to tie the hands of the new emperor so he could give no aid to Spain.

Over a year passed before an election was reached, and there was ample opportunity for intrigue. Mazarin succeeded in obtaining a large influence among the scattered and divided princes of Germany by the liberal use of money. Louis XIV. afterwards preserved it by the same means. The cardinal wrote that to aid in the success of their plans, he would raise money if it left him with only a shirt on his back, but the ambassadors must be sure that its use would produce some effect.[1] The character of the electors, as it is described by the French ambasssadors, was not such as to excite any hesitation in approaching them with practical arguments.

Over the Prince Palatine they believed that they possessed a firm hold. A treaty had been made with him in 1656, by which he agreed to favor the designs of the French king in Germany for 50,000 crowns down, and 40,000 crowns a year.[2] But an additional bargain was now made. The elector got 60,000 crowns or 360,000 francs down, and was to have 240,000 francs more. As the word even of princes could not always be taken in such matters, he was obliged to sign a paper, agreeing to take any action in the congress required by France, and part of the money was put in the hands of a third party.[3]

The Palatine had been in exile during many years, and he had become a judicious prince. In the lower Palatine, which twelve years before the Marshal of Gramont had found only a desert, the villages had been rebuilt; Heidelberg was again a populous place; the fields were cultivated, and the hideous traces of the war had been entirely effaced.

Many of the Palatine's associates were equally willing to take French money, but they received money from Austria

[1] Aff. Etr. All., 140. Mazarin à Gramont, July 20, 1657.

[2] Dumont. Corps. Dip. vi., 2d part, 143.

[3] Aff. Etr. All., 136. Gramont à Mazarin, Aug. 19, 1657. Mém. du Gramont, 289.

also, and their sympathies were stronger with the ancient family of the emperors, than with the Court of France. France had done much for the electorate of Treves. The Archbishop and Elector of Treves was for sale, but Gramont did not succeed in buying him, for the reason, as he says, that he was unable to keep him company in his tremendous drinking bouts.[1] Treves received satisfactory terms from Austria and espoused her interests.

Saxony was wholly in the interests of Austria. The present elector resembled his father in his great consumption of liquor. He combined with this much zeal for the Lutheran faith; to call a man a Calvinist was his bitterest term of reproach, and his piety was such that on the days when he received the communion he never got drunk in the morning.[2] But the French succeeded in obtaining the favor of the electors of Mayence and Cologne. The Archbishop of Mayence was the leading spirit in the college and a man of large ability. He lived well, but without excess. His dinners began at noon, but were always ended by six. He never exceeded his six pints of wine at a meal, and he had strength given him to take that amount without affecting the gravity and decorum befitting an archbishop.[3]

It was soon found that the endeavor to exclude Leopold from the Empire would be a hopeless one. The Elector of Bavaria was a young man of little ability and less ambition, and he was controlled by Austrian influences. Neither by the exhortations of his wife nor of the French ambassadors could he be brought to announce himself as a candidate for the Empire, or to agree to accept the imperial dignity.[4] There was still less chance for Neuburg, and even the electors who were friendly to France were unwilling to go so far as to exclude the House of Austria from the Empire.

But though Mazarin found that he could not prevent Leopold's election, he resolved, if possible, to tie his

[1] Gramont, 292. [2] Gramont, 293. [3] Gramont, 311.
[4] Relation de Gramont, Aff. Etr. All., 142.

hands. The treaty of Westphalia had helped to cripple the Empire, by recognizing the right of its princes and electors to make separate alliances. It was now asked that a declaration should be required of Leopold before his election, that he would give no assistance to the enemies of France. Spain, Austria, and the Pope protested against a measure which they declared extraordinary and contrary to the privileges of the Empire and the provisions of the Golden Bull, but the French succeeded in obtaining the majority of the college to vote in favor of it. The money which they had freely used did much to accomplish such a result. From May to July, 1657, the Archbishop of Mayence alone received 200,000 livres.[1] A profuse magnificence in entertainments and banqueting went side by side with more serious arguments. The dinners began at noon and lasted till nine at night. At one of them everybody was so drunk that the electors danced on the table, and, though the Marshal of Gramont was lame, he led in the dance for the honor of France.[2]

Other things besides bribery and debauchery operated against the purposes of Spain. Her minister at Frankfort was injudicious in his conduct, and succeeded in making the electors believe that Spain had no desire for peace. Germany had suffered so much from the Thirty Years' War, that most of her princes desired above all things a continuation of tranquillity, and they feared lest Germany should become involved again in war in the interests of the Spanish. "The relations of Austria with Spain were known," wrote the Venetian ambassador at Vienna. "No nation was more disliked in Germany than the Spanish. The majority even of the subjects of Austria desired that the interests of the two countries should be divided, and they feared lest from the present wars they should again be involved in such calamities as they had suffered."[3]

Mayence, Cologne, and the Palatine were friendly to France, and Brandenburg at last agreed to vote for the

[1] Comptes de Gravel, Aff. Etr. All., 144.

[2] Mém. de Gramont, 294, 298, 306. [3] Relazione di Nani, cited by Valfrey.

declaration that was demanded.[1] Though Leopold was Elector of Bohemia, his representatives were not allowed to vote on this question, and the French thus had four out of seven. But on May 12th the Palatine demanded some additional advantages. It had been intended to have the vote on the 13th, and the French ambassadors were obliged to grant what he asked. All, then, seemed sure for the 13th, but the Palatine had also been bought by the Swedes, and when he announced his conclusion, he insisted that Leopold should also be required to take no part with Poland in her war against Sweden. This condition repelled Brandenburg, and the session closed amid triumph for the Spanish and dismay for the French. But the refractory Palatine was properly handled, and on May 15th a majority of the electoral college required Leopold to declare that he would invest the Duke of Savoy with Montferrat, would observe inviolably all the conditions of the Peace of Westphalia, and would give no aid to the enemies of France or of her allies, nor to the enemies of the princes and electors of the Empire.[2] On July 18, 1658, the king of Bohemia subscribed to the articles, and on the same day he was elected Emperor as Leopold the First.

But Mazarin desired to add to the effect of this solemn agreement, a league of German princes which should be charged with preventing its violation. The cardinal insisted that Protestants as well as Catholics should be received as members, and that it was indispensable that Sweden should join in it.[3] The wars in which Sweden was then engaged, and in which the Elector of Brandenburg was also involved, rendered the formation of this coalition a difficult one, but on August 14, 1658, the League of the Rhine was created. The Archbishops of Mayence, Treves, and Cologne, the Landgrave of Hesse-Cassel, the King of

[1] Aff. Etr. All., t. 143.

[2] Les ambassadeurs à Mazarin, May 14 and 18, 1658. The articles are found in Dumont, Corps Dip., 2d part, 226–234.

[3] Aff. Etr. Fr., 272. Despatch of Sept. 15, 1657.

Sweden, so far as he was a German prince, and various other of the states of Germany, together with the King of France, joined in this alliance, by which they agreed to protect each other in the rights and the territories secured to their members by the Peace of Westphalia. The League of the Rhine continued in existence for many years, and its influence in Germany was considerable. The position which France held in it was of great value to Louis XIV. in the early part of his career. Many of the German princes, as well as the English kings, were his pensionaries, and in large portions of Germany, France long continued to exert an influence greater than that of Austria. The action of the electors in 1658, and the League of the Rhine, mark the decadence of the control which Spain had formerly exercised in the Empire.[1]

The result of these intrigues in Germany made it more difficult for Spain to obtain aid from Austria, and after the campaign of 1658 it did not seem improbable that Turenne in the next year might conquer the whole of the Spanish Netherlands. The steps which were taken by the French Court in the autumn of 1658, indicated that the marriage which had long been suggested as a possible means of bringing the countries to unite on terms, might soon be impracticable. In October, 1658, Louis and the Court proceeded to Lyons. He arrived there in November, and the most sumptuous fêtes and gayeties engaged the attention of the courtiers. But it was no secret that the journey had been undertaken with more serious purposes. Louis XIV. was now twenty, and it was thought that he should be married. Savoy was an uncertain ally, and a marriage between the king and Margaret of Savoy had been suggested as one that would be advantageous to all.[2] The Princess Margaret was therefore

[1] The authorities for these negotiations are chiefly found in the correspondence for 1657 and 1658. Aff. Etr. All., t. 134–137, 140–144. Mémoires de Gramont, 285–311, contain the account Gramont wrote of his negotiations, which are more fully contained in his despatches. The articles of the League of the Rhine are published in Dumont, Corps Dip., vi., 2d part, 135–140. [2] Aff. Etr. Fr., 277., 310. Dis. Ven., cxxi., 217, *et passim*.

brought to Lyons, and if she was found satisfactory by Louis, it was expected that the alliance would then be arranged.

The news of the contemplated visit and its avowed object led Philip IV. to make the offer which resulted in the Peace of the Pyrenees. In Spain, unlike France, the succession was not confined to males, and through female inheritances and marriages that kingdom had in large part been consolidated. Such a law afforded the opportunity for the indefinite accumulation of kingdoms. Charles V., who sought to create an empire like that of Charlemagne, had suggested the marriage of his daughter with the future Henry II., where one death would have left the couple rulers of France, Spain, Flanders, and all the other possessions in Europe and America that belonged to Charles. They would have been, as the treaty said, the greatest monarchs in the world.[1]

But in the next century the possibility of such a heritage seemed alarming, and instead of a dream of universal empire, it was viewed more as Spain's yielding herself to a French king. Though Anne of Austria had several brothers, a formal renunciation of her rights to the Spanish crown had been executed as one of the conditions of her marriage with Louis XIII. There had never seemed any probability of her becoming the heiress to the inheritance which she thus renounced, and the validity of this instrument had not been discussed. But for many years it had seemed possible that Spain and her possessions might become the heritage of the daughter of Philip IV. In 1646, by the death of her brother, the Infanta, Maria Theresa, became the heir presumptive to the Spanish throne.

During the negotiations for the Peace of Westphalia, the idea of her marriage to Louis XIV. had been suggested, and Mazarin had been eager for such an alliance, if the Spanish Netherlands could be added as a dowry. The possibility of a much greater inheritance was apparent

[1] Negociations relatives à la succession d'Espagne, i., 25, 26.

and Mazarin wrote in 1646, before her brother's death, that if the Infanta were married to his Majesty, France could aspire to the succession of the kingdoms of Spain, whatever renunciation might be made, and that this would not be a remote contingency, as only her brother's life intervened.[1] But the cardinal justly viewed the possession of the Low Countries as more important than this possibility, and if these had ultimately been obtained for France, instead of the throne of Spain for a Bourbon king, the marriage with Maria Theresa would indeed have crowned the Peace of the Pyrenees.

Philip IV. married a second time, but he had no more sons, and his daughter, in 1656, still remained the heir presumptive. Her father was a man well past middle life, and with the infirm health that had become hereditary in the royal family of Spain. When Lionne went to Madrid in the endeavor to make a peace in 1656, he was instructed to intimate that the most liberal concessions would be granted from the demands which France made, if the Infanta could become the wife of Louis XIV. The discreet envoy, when he made the proposition, wrote that he had seen the Infanta and found her pleasing, graceful, and beautiful. When it was declined, he reported that having again seen Maria Theresa, he had not discovered in her either the beauty or the charm, which he had at first imagined that she possessed.[2] The Spanish ministers had then given no encouragement to the suggestion, but since 1656 the situation had been much modified. While France had gained large advantages in the field, the matrimonial value of the Infanta had diminished. In 1657 a son was born to Philip IV., and two lives now stood between Maria Theresa and the throne. The intelligence of this birth was favorably received in France. Anne of Austria's strongest desire was the marriage of her son with her brother's daughter, and this event rendered such an alliance possible. French statesmen felt that by it the

[1] Mazarin à Servien, January 20, 1646.

[2] Lionne à la Reine, Aug. 4 and Sept. 24, 1656.

danger was diminished of a union of Spain, Austria, and the Empire, by the marriage of the Infanta with the young Leopold.[1]

From this time the Spanish ministers contemplated a marriage of the Infanta with Louis XIV. as a means of making peace, but with their customary procrastination, a year passed before any overtures were made. The battle of the Dunes, the League of the Rhine, and, still more, the interview at Lyons stirred them into activity. The offer must be made now, or Louis would soon be married to Margaret of Savoy.

Accordingly Pimentel was ordered to proceed with all haste to the Court of France, and to intimate that Spain was ready to make peace, and that the marriage of the Infanta to Louis XIV. should be one of its conditions.[2]

The French Court, wishing perhaps to give Spain an opportunity to suggest such an alliance, had proceeded to Lyons with great deliberation. Pimentel reached there first, and on November 19th he notified Mazarin of his arrival.[3] His visit was shrouded in mystery, and when the cardinal reached Lyons they held secret interviews. The Spanish had suggested a truce for a year, to give time for the discussion of terms of peace, but Mazarin declined

[1] Dis. Ven., cxx., 179. Mém. de Motteville, 468.

[2] Archives nationales. Documents sur la Paix des Pyrenées. K. 1616, c. 3. The documents and letters in reference to the Peace of the Pyrenees are largely found in that collection. Also in Aff. Etr. Espagne, t. 34, 35, etc. Mazarin's letters to Le Tellier, which contain a full history of the negotiations at the Isle of Pheasants, are found, in copies, at the Bibliothèque Nationale, Mss., 4213., 4214., and Tellier's replies, 4215. Many of the most important papers and letters have been printed, and may be found in "Ambassades de Hugues de Lionne," and in "Négociations relatives à la Succession d'Espagne," t. 1. Two volumes, containing most of Mazarin's letters about his negotiations with Luis de Haro, are published in an edition of Amsterdam, 1745. Some of these letters, with the errors of that edition corrected, are found in Chantelauze's "Louis XIV. et Marie Mancini." The correspondence of Mazarin, Lionne, and Le Tellier and the documents of the "Archives nationales" enable one to follow the history of the treaty with accuracy. The negotiations of the Island of Pheasants are also described, usually with correctness, in Dis. Ven., cxxii., *et passim.*

[3] Aff. Etr. Esp., 34. Pimenter à Mazarin.

to check the progress of the French arms. Pimentel therefore wrote to Madrid for authority to negotiate a final peace at once.[1]

In the meantime the Duke and Duchess of Savoy and their daughter had arrived at Lyons. Louis was not at once notified of Pimentel's errand, and he found the Princess Margaret agreeable to his tastes. Courtiers already saw in her the future queen, when the proposals of Pimentel destroyed her matrimonial hopes. The change in Louis' manner was apparent, and Mazarin felt bound to inform the duchess of the proposals that had been made, and that the interests of France required them to consider this opportunity for the restoration of peace. As some consolation a written promise was given, that if a treaty for marriage with the Infanta was not made by May, 1659, Louis would then marry Margaret of Savoy.[2] The mother dropped a few tears, but if the daughter felt any regret at the probable loss of the most brilliant match in Christendom, she was able to conceal it. She bore herself with dignity and apparent unconcern.

In many respects the alliance with Savoy would have been as acceptable to Mazarin as that with the Infanta. His niece was married to a prince of Savoy, and his relations with that house were intimate and amicable. But not only was the Spanish marriage the great desire of Anne of Austria, but the peace which would result from it was much desired by the minister. His confidential letters show that he hoped that the victories of Turenne might at last compel the Spanish to sue for peace.[3] Though the armies of France were victorious, her finances were involved and her people weary of war. Mazarin's physical infirmities were increasing, and he wished to crown his career by another treaty which would rank with that of Westphalia.

Curiosity had been excited in all Europe as to the reason why the alliance with Savoy had not been ar-

[1] Arch. nat., *supra.* [2] Executed Dec. 6th. Published by Valfrey.
[3] Aff. Etr. Fr., 275. Mazarin à la Reine, Aug. 2, 1658, *et passim.*

ranged. In the explanations which the cardinal felt bound to send his diplomatic agents, he professed to regard the negotiations with Spain as unlikely to result in peace, and a marriage with the Infanta, since the birth of her brother, as presenting no great advantages.[1] But in truth, Pimentel received further authority from Madrid, and came to Paris, and the negotiations for a final peace were conducted with vigor, though also with great secrecy. They made such progress that an armistice was declared when the season was reached for military operations, and in June, 1659, a treaty was signed. It provided for the marriage of the Infanta with Louis XIV. France was to hold substantially all the conquests she had made down to 1656, and to restore most of the places she had taken since. The Spanish struggled hard to obtain favorable terms for the Prince of Condé, but without success. Upon asking forgiveness of the king, his rank and property in France would be restored to him, but not the governments which he had possessed. Mazarin would agree to nothing more, and Pimentel yielded. But the Spanish were determined that Portugal should not be included in the treaty, for they were as resolved on the subjugation of that rebellious kingdom, as they had formerly been on crushing rebellion in the United Provinces. The relations between France and Portugal had not for some years been very close, but still, though no treaty prevented, it seemed harsh to leave this ally exposed unaided to the vengeance of Spain. Mazarin offered to return all the conquests France had made in the Low Countries if Portugal could be included in the peace, but it is probable that he made so great an offer, because he knew it would not be accepted. Many questions required still further adjustment, and it was therefore agreed that Mazarin and Don Luis de Haro, the chief ministers of the two countries, should meet and arrange personally concerning them.[2]

[1] Mazarin à Bordeaux, Dec., 13, 1658 ; à Gravel, Dec. 17th. In September, 1658, he told the Venetian ambassador that the king would marry the Infanta, if the Spanish proposed it. Dis. Ven., cxxi., 150.

[2] Aff. Etr. Esp., 35. Arch. nationales cited *supra*.

In June, Mazarin left Paris for the conference, and Haro also started from Madrid. The great interests that were to be settled by this treaty, the long war which it would end, and the unusual feature that it was to be negotiated in person by the two men who were the rulers of the countries they represented, drew the attention of all Europe to the Isle of Pheasants, the curious place that had been fixed upon for the meeting. There also resorted the representatives of almost every important European power. The Empire and Sweden, the republic of England and the king of England, Savoy and Modena, the kingdom of Portugal, the Pope, the Duke of Lorraine, the Prince of Condé, and many other persons and states of more or less importance, all desired to have some part in the great treaty, and Mazarin hoped that one might be made which would regulate the affairs of Europe and ensure a stable and universal peace.[1]

A domestic incident disturbed the cardinal when he was devoting himself to making peace for Europe, and it seemed as if it might destroy the basis of the whole treaty, and leave France and Spain again involved in an almost endless war. Among Mazarin's many nieces was Marie Mancini, a girl not possessed of any extraordinary beauty, but vivacious, ambitious, and charming. Like her sisters and cousins, she was thrown very intimately with the king, and his friendship grew into affection. Marie Mancini equalled Mme. de Maintenon both in ambition and discretion, and Louis' passion reached such a height that he implored his mother and the cardinal to allow him to marry her.

Some contemporary writers claimed that the cardinal was for a moment allured by the prospect of seeing his niece the queen of France, and one of them has described Anne of Austria declaring to him that the French people would rise in revolt against such baseness, and she herself would march at their head.[2] This famous conver-

[1] Conversation with Giustiniani, Dis. Ven., cxxii., 67.

[2] Motteville, 475.

sation occurred, doubtless, only in the imagination of the zealous friend, who does not claim to have heard it. Such was not the language with which the queen addressed Mazarin, and the surer record of his letters and his conduct does not show that he ever approved so injudicious a measure. He had nothing to gain by it and much to lose. He would become the uncle of a queen, instead of the successor of Richelieu. To have his niece the queen of France might under some circumstances have gratified his vanity, but the negotiations for the Spanish alliance had been practically arranged when the passion of Louis XIV. reached its height. The cardinal would have sacrificed the treaty which he believed would help to ensure him permanent fame; he would have incurred the enmity of the nation for the continuance of the war, the enmity of the queen for interfering with her favorite scheme, and the enmity of Louis, so soon as his passion had abated, and he realized that the greatest prince in the world had made a misalliance. Had Marie been able to control the king's policy, it would not have advanced the interests of Mazarin. He already possessed to the fullest extent the affection and the confidence of Louis XIV., and he had little hold on his niece, who was impatient, ungovernable, and wasted very little love on her uncle.[1]

At all events, he resolved to put an end to this affair of the heart, and in June, 1659, Marie Mancini was ordered to leave the Court, and she was taken to Brouage. She was then a girl of twenty, with a passionate and ambitious nature, and she not only hoped to become a queen, but she was also fond of Louis. The unhappy lover wept at the parting. "You weep; you are the king, and I depart," said the poor Marie as she was driven away.[2] But the af-

[1] The question of the relations of Louis XIV. and Marie Mancini and what Mazarin's original desires were, has received an amount of attention which seems out of proportion to its importance. M. Cherucl gives it twenty-five pages in his history, and Chantelauze has devoted a whole volume to the subject.

[2] This parting, with some variety of expression, is given by a large number of contemporary writers, and Marie seems to have said something of this nature.

fair was not ended yet. Permission to write was injudiciously granted the lovers, in order somewhat to console the king's melancholy. The permission was used with the ardor of eager lovers. "You do not write letters every day," Mazarin remonstrated with Louis, "but entire volumes. You have no time, except to write your own letters and read the answers." "The king is sending off volumes to La Rochelle and cultivating a passion which will only make him unhappy," Mazarin told the queen.[1] The cardinal wrote the king, in letters that are creditable to his good judgment, and speak much for the manner in which he educated his royal pupil, that to refuse to marry the Infanta would expose his state and his subjects to great evils, and that he should not sacrifice to any temporary passion his honor and the preservation of his kingdom.[2] Louis agreed to the negotiations for the marriage, but the cardinal insisted that he should also abandon any feeling that would make the Infanta's lot unhappy, and he wrote so sharp a letter on the king's conduct and the disgrace of a misalliance with one who had a thousand faults and not a good quality, that he drew from Louis a very curt and sulky reply.[3] But the affair was at last broken off. Marie found that Louis' marriage with the Infanta was settled upon, and she stopped the correspondence. Mazarin wrote to the girl who had lost her lover and the throne of France, advising her to find consolation in reading Seneca. It is not strange that the cardinal's nieces had little love for their uncle.

In the meantime, the negotiators for peace had met on the Isle of Pheasants. This is a little island, but a few hundred feet long, in a small stream that divided France from Spain. While the southern half belonged to Spain, the northern half was in the territory of France. It had, therefore, been chosen, with great diplomatic nicety, as a place where the representatives of the two nations could meet without either making any undignified ad-

[1] Mazarin au Roi, Aug. 28th, à la Reine, Aug. 26th.
[2] Mazarin au Roi, July 16th. [3] *Ib.*, Aug. 28th and Sept. 1st.

vances. On the island were erected temporary dwellings, which were also divided into precisely equal parts. The rooms of the ministers opened into a common apartment, into which they could enter unattended and confer with each other. Even this had to be furnished one half by each, and Mazarin complained there was enough time wasted over having the tapestries the same, to finish the negotiations and restore peace to Christendom.[1] He was delayed by the gout, and the Spanish by formalities, and it was not until August 13th that the interviews began between the two ministers.

It had been hoped that the treaty signed in June would leave little more to be done, but Don Luis de Haro endeavored to obtain some changes in its provisions, and these and all other questions which arose were debated with Spanish tenacity and slowness. The ministers met and talked together four, five, or six hours at a time, yet nearly three months' time was occupied before the treaty was signed. The article of the marriage caused little trouble. Don Luis insisted on the Infanta's renouncing her rights to the Spanish succession. Mazarin protested in vain that France sacrificed much of the advantage she had gained in the war for this alliance, but if it was to be hampered by a renunciation, Louis himself was certainly quite as good a match as the Infanta. Haro told him that should Philip IV. die leaving no sons, they should hope rather than expect that France would not claim the inheritance, but the form of a renunciation they must have.[2] Mazarin agreed to it, but insisted on a dowry of 500,000 crowns, payable in three years, and Lionne drew the articles in such a manner that Maria Theresa's renunciation was upon the condition this should be paid. The Spanish minister objected to such a proviso, but he was told it could do no harm, if they intended to pay the money. The articles were so drawn, and the dower was not paid, and this was afterwards claimed by Louis XIV. as a ground for insisting that the renuncia-

[1] Mazarin à Le Tellier, Aug. 5th and 10th; Lionne, Aug. 12th.

[2] *Ib.*, Aug. 17th and 23d.

tion had never been of any force.[1] Construing an instrument which affected the welfare of nations as one would an ordinary commercial contract, the claim seems to have been well founded.

But the chief contention in these protracted negotiations was over the interests of the Prince of Condé. The Spanish had decided that obtaining some advantage for the prince was a matter of honor, and they therefore gave to this more attention than to any question of real importance for Spain. The interests of the prince had caused the rupture in 1656, and they nearly broke off the negotiations for the Peace of the Pyrenees. By the treaty signed in June, Pimentel had agreed to the terms imposed by France. Condé should have pardon and his property, but not the governments which had made him dangerous. The prince had been dismayed by this desertion. He asked for himself and his followers a restoration of all the governments and offices which they had held in France, or he would be content if Spain would give him Franche Comté, and let him hold it as an independent sovereign.[2]

Condé, however, was anxious to return to France, and asked that the negotiations should not be broken off, even if his demands were refused. But a clique of his zealous followers surrounded Don Luis de Haro, furnished him arguments to use, and impressed upon him that Spanish honor would be tarnished unless something good was obtained for the prince. Haro began asking that some additional grace should be extended to Condé, and it was in vain that Mazarin insisted that the whole matter was regulated by the treaty of June, and that unless Spain intended to repudiate that, the question was ended. During every interview for weeks Don Luis argued, pleaded, and entreated for the prince. He asked how a prince of such merit could live in France with proper state, unless he possessed his former governments. Mazarin replied that Condé could live like fifty other princes of the blood, who,

[1] Narration par Lionne, Aff. Etr. Esp., 41. Contract of Marriage, article 4. [2] Instructions pour Caillet, published in Lenet, 627–630.

though they had never been traitors to their country, were content with the revenues of their private estates. Don Luis protested that if Condé were thus treated, Spain could not hope to gain allies in the future; but the cardinal answered that he did not wish to furnish any inducement for French subjects to ally themselves with the Spanish king.[1]

But Mazarin advised that an offer should be made to give Condé the government of Burgundy, if Spain would grant some additional places to France. In Burgundy the prince could do no harm, and if he behaved himself, he would probably, before many years, receive as much as that, as a gift from the king. By this device the Spanish would satisfy their vanity and do something for their ally, at the cost of some strong places.[2] After refusing to listen to Don Luis' protests, the cardinal at last intimated that while infinitely preferring the conditions of the treaty of June, Condé could have the government of Burgundy on these terms.[3] The Spanish minister was very loath to add to the long list of places which were already to be ceded, but Condé's friends were pertinacious, and Don Luis was far from having Richelieu's ability to say no. It was agreed therefore that upon condition of Condé's asking pardon for his rebellion, and the king of Spain's granting to France the important city of Avesnes and the country depending on it, and returning Juliers to the Duke of Neuburg, the prince should not only receive his private estate, making no claim for damages during the years he had been deprived of its income, but he should also be made governor of Burgundy, and his son should have the office of Grand Master, which the prince had formerly held. Condé was obliged to surrender Rocroi, and abandon all claim to the government of Guienne, and his son was obliged to relinquish his claim to the government of Champagne. His followers were pardoned and their private estates were restored, but they were not

[1] Mazarin à Le Tellier, Aug. 21st.

[2] *Ib.*, Aug. 14th; au Roi., Aug. 21st.

[3] *Ib.*, Aug. 25th.

given the offices or governments which they had formerly possessed. Even after this was agreed upon, the zeal of Condé's friends nearly caused a breach between the plenipotentiaries. Lionne had drafted most of the treaty, but Don Luis said he also could be a draughtsman, and he accordingly presented articles in reference to the prince, which had been prepared by Lenet and some other of his followers. They changed nothing in substance, but they contained long recitals of how the high and mighty Louis of Bourbon had for certain reasons retired from France, but had never ceased to labor for a just reconciliation and a general peace, which had been the sole object of his desires. The messenger had already been ordered to start and make the formal demand for the Infanta's hand, which would close the negotiation. When Mazarin saw these articles, he stopped him on his journey, and informed Don Luis that if he insisted that the French king should be insulted in the wording of the treaty he could advise him at two that afternoon, and the cardinal would thereupon announce the step which had been resolved upon. Haro at last abandoned his attempts to soothe further the wounded pride of the Prince of Condé, and said that Mazarin could draw the articles about him as he saw fit, and he would sign them without reading.[1]

No change was made in the terms about Portugal. Mazarin offered to restore to Condé all that he had possessed, if the Spanish would include Portugal in the treaty. The offer was not accepted, and the cardinal knew it would not be when he made it.[2] Nothing was secured for Portugal but a truce for three months. France agreed to furnish her no further aid, an agreement which was afterwards to a large extent evaded. It was, perhaps, felt that the conduct of France was not chival-

[1] Mazarin à Le Tellier, Sept. 30th and Oct. 3d. These letters contain a copy of the articles as presented by Don Luis. The articles inserted in the treaty recited that the prince had confessed his extreme regret for his conduct, and would gladly redeem with his blood the acts of hostility he had committed both within and without France.—Art. 79.

[2] Mazarin à Le Tellier, Aug. 19th.

rous, for Mazarin insisted that this should be one of the secret articles.[1] Spain's pertinacity in reference to Portugal did her no good. She was so reduced by the war that Portugal alone was more than a match for her.

There was much discussion of the affairs of England. The death of Oliver Cromwell had greatly diminished the influence of that country in Europe. With the internal troubles that were now showing themselves, Charles II. claimed that his restoration would be easy, and he endeavored to have France and Spain agree to aid him. Don Luis said that he would like to give him some encouragement, because the mild and pleasant way in which Charles asked for aid contrasted so agreeably with the terrible importunities of the Duke of Lorraine. Both ministers agreed that the republic of England would be a power to be dreaded by its neighbors, and much more formidable than that country under its kings, so that it was for their interest to restore the Stuarts.[2] An agent offered to Mazarin that Charles II. should marry one of his nieces and give him the government of Ireland, if he would espouse the king's cause.[3] But the cardinal declined to involve France in any agreement for the restoration of the Stuarts, and it was agreed that she should remain neutral in the war which still continued between England and Spain.[4]

The preparation of so long a treaty, and the contests over the possessions ceded, occupied a great deal of time. Mazarin complained that if the Spanish were to discuss every word, the conference would last till the day of judgment, but every thing was finally agreed upon.[5] The negotiations about the Peace of the Pyrenees are among

[1] It is Article 3 of the Secret Articles.

[2] Mazarin à Tellier, Nov. 6th. *Ib.*, Aug. 25th and Oct. 24th. "Que la Republique d'Angleterre s'etablisssant, ce seroit une puissance à redouter par tous ses voisins, puisque, sans exagération, elle seroit cent fois plus considerable, que n'etoit celle des rois d'Angleterre," etc. Mazarin's estimate of the influence England would have, if she was governed by Charles II., seems to have been accurate.

[3] Bodkin à Mazarin, June 24th and July 22d and 30th. Aff. Etr. Esp., 35.

[4] Articles Secrets, 1.

[5] Mazarin à Lionne, Sept. 27th.

the many illustrations of Mazarin's enormous industry, and their study must impress one also with his extraordinary ability as a diplomat. He was suffering from gout and gravel, from which he died within two years. Notwithstanding this, in less than three months spent at the Isle of Pheasants, he attended twenty-five formal conferences, each of which lasted from four to six hours. The letters he wrote, which have been published, fill over two volumes, and a great number have not yet been printed. He consulted constantly with Lionne as to every detail of the treaty, and he had frequent interviews with the representatives and agents of all the princes and states who desired attention given to their interests.

It was now sure that peace would be made, and the Spanish wished a special envoy sent to demand the hand of the Infanta. The Marshal of Gramont was chosen for this duty, which he was exceedingly well qualified to perform. He went, surrounded with the state which was gratifying to Spanish pride. The envoy of a young king asking the hand of a princess should, he thought, proceed with hot haste, in order to manifest the lover's impatience, and he delighted the Spanish taste for romance and ancient gallantry, by proceeding at full gallop from the gates of Madrid to the palace of the king. He presented the request of his master, and it was favorably answered. He saw the Infanta and endeavored to fill the rôle of one who has to present the love of his master, but his eloquence extracted from her Spanish taciturnity only one sentence in reply. From this, he wrote Mazarin, he could not form an accurate judgment as to her mind, but he found her person in every way charming. Her eyes were piercing and her mouth beautiful, but as she opened it so little he could not report about her teeth.[1] The Spanish festivities pleased him less than the future queen. The music, he said, was diabolical; the feasts were superb, but there was nothing one could eat.[2]

[1] Gramont à Mazarin, Oct. 22d, printed in his memoirs.

[2] Mém. de Gramont, 311–320, and letters there published.

Every thing was now adjusted, and on November 7, 1659, Mazarin and Don Luis de Haro, in behalf of their respective countries, signed the Peace of the Pyrenees.[1] Many of its articles have already been stated. It granted to France Roussillon and the county of Conflans. Catalonia was abandoned to Spain, and it was declared that the Pyrenees should divide the two countries. All of Artois, except two or three cities, was annexed to France, together with Gravelines and various places in Flanders, and considerable portions of Hainault and Luxembourg. The other places belonging to Spain, which were held by France, were surrendered. It was agreed that the Duke of Lorraine should be reinstated, but the fortifications of Nancy were to be destroyed, and the better portion of his duchy was to be ceded to France. If he did not see fit to accept these terms, France would continue in the rights she claimed over the entire duchy by virtue of previous treaties. The Duke Charles made Haro's existence wretched by his protests at what he claimed was the abandonment of his interests by Spain, and he refused to accept the terms of the treaty.[2] The affairs of Condé and the relations of Portugal and England were regulated as had been agreed by the ministers, and a large number of questions in reference to various Italian princes were also disposed of. The articles about the marriage of Louis and Maria Theresa were signed at the same time, and were regarded as forming part of the Peace of the Pyrenees.

By the treaty France gained two provinces and parts of three others. The war had added largely to her territory, and it had established her superiority over Spain. The countries annexed were those which might naturally and

[1] With the exception of the secret articles, the treaty is published in Dumont, Corps. Dip., vi., 2d part, 264–280. These are found in the Archives nationales.

[2] Haro complained of the discomfort he suffered from the vehemence of Lorraine's protests and demands, but Mazarin told him he was justly punished for being so slow in finishing the treaty that the duke had time to be released from prison and reach the Isle of Pheasants.

advantageously become portions of France, and they increased her prosperity as well as her power. But the treaty has not escaped criticism. For sixteen years it had been charged that Mazarin would not make peace, and when he did make it, he was blamed for making it too soon. In another campaign, it was claimed, Turenne could have completed the conquest of the Spanish Netherlands and have compelled their cession to France.

Though this might possibly have been the case, Mazarin seems to have been justified in accepting the terms that were offered. At the Isle of Pheasants, as at Münster, he adopted the course of the prudent gamester, and made sure of large gains, instead of risking them in the chance of winning more. In 1659 Spain was indeed so exhausted that from her, unaided, France could easily have conquered what remained of the Spanish Netherlands. But it is not probable that she would have been allowed to make such accessions to her territory without opposition. The fear of having France for a neighbor had led Holland to desert her ally at Westphalia, and the United Provinces were now considering an alliance with Spain to prevent that result. Though Leopold was bound by the promise given when he was elected Emperor, it was only a promise. Overtures had been made for his marriage with Maria Theresa, and, had they been accepted, there is little doubt that the Emperor would have used all his resources to prevent the dismemberment of the Spanish monarchy.

France on the other hand could expect little assistance from England, in the condition of that country after the death of Oliver Cromwell, and she might have found herself opposed to a coalition such as was subsequently formed against Louis XIV. Her own people were suffering from the effects of the long war and from the burden of constantly increasing taxation. During 1658 and 9 there were risings in Normandy, Poitou and other provinces, of people made desperate by the exactions of the tax gatherer.[1] Peace had long been delayed, and to neglect a

[1] See for these Dis. Ven., cxx., cxxi., cxxii., *pas.*; and Lettres de Colbert, t. i.

favorable opportunity for securing it would have been to prolong misery for the chance of aggrandizement.

A more serious question is whether Mazarin acted wisely in having the marriage with Maria Theresa one of the conditions of the peace. To a certain extent this was a defensive measure. Her marriage with the Emperor was contemplated, and the French were dismayed at the possibility of seeing Spain, Austria, and the Empire under one ruler.[1] For Louis XIV. to marry a Spanish princess was not an important measure, except from the chance of what she might inherit, and undoubtedly the king and his advisers, and even the Spanish, attached little importance to the renunciation. No one expected it would be regarded, and few considered it as of any validity. To obtain for the king of France a claim to the succession of Spain was an unwise and chimerical measure, if it was to result in an endeavor to unite two separate nations under one ruler. It was puerile as well as unwise, if it was to involve France in war in order to gratify the vanity of its sovereign by placing one of his family on the Spanish throne. But Mazarin's correspondence, during the years that this marriage was regarded as a possibility, seems to indicate that, in case the succession should fall to Maria Theresa or her heirs, he hoped that France might gain provinces which, like Flanders or Franche Comté, could become integral parts of the kingdom. The evils of the war of the Spanish succession, which crippled France half a century later, can hardly be attributed to the negotiators of the Peace of the Pyrenees.

The marriage itself did not take place until June, 1660. The two kings then met on the frontiers of their kingdoms, and the various ceremonies and interviews were attended with much state and display. The taste for mountain scenery had not been discovered in the seventeenth century. Those of the French courtiers who visited the Pyrenees complained of the frightful solitudes

[1] Mazarin à Le Tellier, Aug. 23, 1659 ; à Bordeaux, Dec. 13, 1658, etc. The references to this are frequent.

of the mountains, the horrid rocks, and appalling heights. The ladies criticised also the ungainly dresses of the Spanish women, their enormous coiffures and great quantities of false hair, their foreheads entirely exposed and unrelieved by frizzes.[1]

During this year Turenne received the reward which he had earned by his great services. He was made marshal-general, and the highest military rank in France was justly bestowed upon her greatest soldier.

While Mazarin was at the Isle of Pheasants, questions were brought before him in which he showed less ability and less zeal than in the negotiations for the Peace of the Pyrenees. The restoration of order after the end of the Fronde had enabled the government again to collect its revenues throughout all France. Notwithstanding this, the expenses of the war and the disorders and frauds which had become a part of the financial system would have rendered heavy taxation certain, but these evils were vastly exaggerated by the colossal corruption of the Superintendent Fouquet. In 1652, Colbert wrote Mazarin that the irregularities in the finances and the constant want of money would destroy the state, unless he applied himself to discover the cause of these evils, and to correct them.[2]

Nothing had been done, and the treasury was placed under the control of a man who had the ability to make the greatest use of its disorders, and to plunder and squander on a scale of extraordinary magnificence. Servien and Nicholas Fouquet were made superintendents of finance in 1653, the one an experienced and upright diplomat, and the other a man who had shown capacity and devotion to Mazarin during the troubles of the Fronde. Fouquet soon manifested much ability as a financier of a certain sort, and he developed qualities which had not appeared in his early career. The government was always in need of ready money, and its credit was always bad. Fouquet gathered about him a body of financiers to whom he

[1] Mém. de Mme. de Motteville, 487, 491.

[2] Lettres de Colbert, i., 192.

allowed enormous profits and from whom he could obtain ready money at all times, and this rendered him valuable to an impecunious administration. The abuses which he practised were odious to Servien, and the financiers refused to deal except with Fouquet. In 1654 the latter succeeded in having the raising of money placed entirely in his hands, and he freed himself more and more from any restraint in the management of the treasury, until Servien's death, early in 1659, left him sole superintendent.

The financial system was such that it had long been difficult to exercise any supervision, and Fouquet endeavored, and with success, to increase the confusion, until no one could discover what became of the nation's money. The sums raised by taxation were large, and the duties were so increased from 1653 to 1660, that it was claimed the amount received from their farm should have been augmented by one third. It diminished rather than increased, and in 1659 Colbert charged that while the net income of the government ought to have been 90,000,000 livres, the equivalent, perhaps, of $90,000,000 now, it did not exceed 40,000,000 livres.[1]

Such colossal waste was caused in many ways. Instead of the expenses being defrayed from the current receipts, the government was always living on its future income. Advances were made on the taxes that would be collected in one or two years, and on these the government paid, on the average, interest at the rate of fifteen per cent. per annum. But this great profit to the financiers furnished the opportunity for still greater frauds. The legal rate of interest was less than six per cent. That lenders might receive larger rates and still have their accounts allowed by law, obligations were given them for two or three times the amounts they actually advanced. When the loan was repaid it was supposed in theory that the interest would be paid on all the obligations, and the principal be paid of one, but these duplicate instruments were often used to cover robberies perpetrated by Fouquet and his associates.

[1] Colbert à Mazarin, Oct. 1, 1659.

The farms of the taxes were attended with similar prodigality. The friends of the superintendent were the only ones who could hope to receive them, and they were awarded at figures that allowed enormous profits. The appliances for fraud were not yet exhausted. As the government was rarely supplied with ready money, orders were given its creditors drawn on various funds. Some of these funds were not good for the amount of the orders outstanding, and the officers of the treasury had almost an unlimited discretion as to which they would pay, and which they would postpone. There were thus outstanding a vast amount of state orders, some of which had originally represented valid debts and some of which had not. These could be bought for a small per cent. on their face value. Great quantities of them were obtained, redrawn on funds that were good, and paid in full. Orders outstanding since 1620 were said to have been bought at three or four cents on the dollar, and then redeemed at par.[1] The operation was the same as it would have been for an American official of the Treasury to have purchased old notes issued by the Continental Congress, and have passed them in at par in settlement of his accounts. As the monies received by the government were not sufficient for its needs, large quantities of new rentes were issued. On some of them it did not receive over fifty cents on the dollar, and on large amounts that were entirely fraudulent it received nothing.

None of these appliances were originated by Fouquet; he only developed them with the magnificence of a corrupt genius. The enormous and unconscionable gains of those who dealt with the government had been cause for just complaint for over forty years, and these were increased under Fouquet. One treasurer of the exchequer asserted that he had made a million and a half in a year. There were financiers who became worth ten, twelve, and fourteen million livres. They built magnificent palaces, kept titled mistresses, and gambled away with

[1] Lettres de Colbert, vii., 166.

indifference two and three hundred thousand livres in a night.[1]

But while Fouquet hoped to become indispensable by his ability to raise ready money at any time, he desired also to obtain for himself from this corruption and confusion, the means to satisfy a profligacy and extravagance not unworthy the most corrupt times of the Roman empire. The total amounts which he drew from the treasury can not be ascertained, but Colbert probably did not exaggerate when he charged that within a few years Fouquet squandered in his private expenses between twenty and thirty millions.[2] He received one hundred and forty thousand livres a year from the farmers of the aides, one hundred and twenty thousand a year from the farmers of the salt tax, and shared in the profits of all who battened on the treasury, apart from the amounts which he took from it directly. He bought the duchy of Penthievre for about two millions. He spent enormous sums on his chateau near Melun, and it was said that he expended eight millions at Vaux. He bought the island and fortress of Belle Isle. Some efforts at concealment were made in these acquisitions. The duchy of Penthievre was purchased in the name of a friend. His agents were instructed to hasten the erection of his enormous buildings, during seasons when few of the nobility were in the country, and to employ smaller bodies of men and work with more moderation, when they might be observed by those who would report his proceedings at Court.[3]

The money which Fouquet took from the treasury was squandered on women as well as on other luxuries. While his antechamber was filled with those who were told that the superintendent's duties required his attention, while his admirers talked of the hours of toil he gave to the service of the state, he was often beguiling his time with the various ladies, whose friendship for him was liberally paid from

[1] Mém. sur les Finances, Lettres, etc., de Colbert, ii., 28. Financiers was the general title of those who had money dealings with the government.

[2] *Ibid.*

[3] Fouquet à Courtois, Feb. 8, 1657.

the treasury of France. It was a part of the infatuation that marked Fouquet's career, that he kept all his letters. When he was arrested, these were at once seized, and among them were found great numbers of most indiscreet ones from female correspondents to this financial Don Juan, letters from countesses and marchionesses and maids of honor, letters which seemed almost to verify the cynical French proverb, that a superintendent of the finances never found a woman cruel. Some had been his mistresses, some had been his spies, some had been his go-betweens, some had only taken his money and given their friendship, but women as well as men had united in the worship of the Golden Calf. Even letters from Mme. de Sévigné were found among the great collection. There was nothing in them which reflected on her good name, for amid a corrupt court she was always discreet, but she was a good friend of Fouquet's, and, in her correspondence with her daughter, it can be seen how such a career as his excited no severe animadversion, even in persons of Mme. de Sevigné's character. She was among the many, who were friendly to the superintendent to the last, and who, though they could not prevent his overthrow, did what they could to lessen his punishment.

Fouquet tried to strengthen his position by gaining the favor of all who could help him. Not only among women and contractors, but among all who had any influence, the money of the treasury was freely spent. Lionne was in need, and he came to Fouquet for assistance and received it. The Duke of Rochefoucauld practised the morality he preached and took 10,000 crowns. Beaufort, Gramont, the Marquis of Gesvres, judges of the Parliament, officers of the army and the navy, were on his pension list.

He exercised perhaps a more judicious liberality in what he did for artists and men of letters. Fouquet had the fondness and the cultivated taste for literature and art, which are not unfrequently united with unbounded corruption and extreme sensuality. He appreciated and en-

couraged the genius of Molière and La Fontaine. He relieved Corneille from the neglect he suffered at the hands of a public, which preferred the buffoonery of Scarron. Saint-Evremond sent him secret letters filled with witty abuse of Mazarin's policy. Poets sang of Fouquet, the generous benefactor of Parnassus, their kind and adorable master. Poussin and Le Brun owed much to his liberal patronage of art.

Such a career could not be free from danger, and Fouquet took measures to defend himself against any loss of favor. When he was at last overthrown, he sought to excuse all the irregularities discovered in his accounts by throwing the blame on Mazarin. Mazarin was by no means free from responsibility for these monstrous abuses. He wanted large sums of money in order to prosecute with vigor the wars in which France was engaged, and if the money was raised, he made little inquiry as to how much it cost the country to obtain it. Though he must have known somewhat of Fouquet's reckless courses, he feared to remove him, lest a successor could not be found who would have the same ability to raise money. He was friendly to the superintendent on account of the services he had rendered during the Fronde; he was accustomed to corruption in the finances and to seeing superintendents and contractors become millionaires, and his own transactions with the treasury were so numerous and sometimes of so doubtful a character, that he may not have desired a man of rigid views to examine them.

Mazarin's greed for money became stronger in the latter years of his life. In addition to the pensions, livings, and governments which he enjoyed, he insisted on taking many contracts for furnishing provisions to the soldiers and army supplies to the government. He even furnished the watches that were to be given away by the embassadors in Germany.[1] It may have been true, as Mazarin claimed, that he saved money to the government by these measures, and that he plundered less than other contract-

[1] Mazarin à Colbert, June 27, 1657.

ors.[1] Colbert often advised him to let such things alone, and said that he could make more money in other ways.[2] But undoubtedly the gains were large, and there was something pitiful in a prime-minister's thus mingling the rôle of a Richelieu with that of a jobber and old-clothes man.

It had the additional disadvantage, that he was made dependent on a superintendent, who would not scrutinize his accounts closely and would pay them promptly. He undoubtedly received the most liberal treatment from Fouquet, and the superintendent gave him opportunities to make snug advances to the government at fifteen per cent. interest.[3]

Notwithstanding this, as early as 1657, Fouquet began to fear that Mazarin might remove him from office. He knew that the cardinal constantly gave more of his confidence to Colbert, and he recognized in Colbert his most dangerous enemy. The superintendent was so intoxicated by the wealth and state that he now enjoyed, that he dreamed of a renewal of the Fronde, and imagined that he was powerful enough to resist the government if his overthrow was attempted. He fortified the island of Belle Isle with the greatest care, bought ships and cannon, and endeavored to make of it a place so strong, that once there he could defy attempts to arrest him. Among his papers was found a plan for resistance, in case he was arrested or an attempt was made to bring him to trial. It was first prepared in 1657, and stated that Mazarin was of a jealous disposition, inclined to listen to Fouquet's enemies, and forgetful of the past services of those of whom he thought he had no further need. In case, therefore, that an attempt was made to arrest him, Calais was to be held by the Count of Charost in the interests of the superintendent. Belle Isle was to be defended, and friends elsewhere were indicated who would rise in revolt. The governors of Amiens, Hesdin, and Arras, he hoped would

[1] Mazarin à Lionne, July 21, 1658. [2] Lettres de Colbert, i., 390 *et pas.*

[3] Fouquet à Mazarin, Dec. 11, 1659. Colbert advised similar investments, being zealous in his patron's interest. Colbert à Mazarin, Oct. 30, 1653.

resist the government in behalf of their benefactor. Privateers must also be sent out who would ravage the French merchant marine.[1]

This paper was one of those upon which an accusation of high treason was afterwards based. Fouquet's only defence was that it had not been carried into effect, and that, at all events, as Mazarin, governed by Colbert, was abusing the confidence of the king, to resist a step instigated by him should not be regarded as opposition to the sovereign.

Such had been the reasoning of the Fronde. The manner in which Mazarin was spoken of in this paper seems to show that the cardinal's dealings with the treasury had not been such as to give Fouquet any hold upon him, or make it necessary that the latter should remain there. The superintendent's complaint was rather that as the cardinal had no need of him in the treasury, he forgot his services in the time of the Fronde.

In 1659 Colbert began his attack, and in October he sent to Mazarin a long memoir, exposing Fouquet's methods and his enormous prodigality, and charging that many millions were stolen from the treasury yearly. He asked Mazarin to appoint a chamber of justice, take the control of the treasury into his own hands, stop the reckless system of anticipating the revenues, and restore order to the national finances.[2] Fouquet's spies were everywhere. An officer of the posts took this memoir and sent it at once to the superintendent. It was opened and copied, and was then allowed to be forwarded to Mazarin. It threw Fouquet and his associates into great alarm. It was necessary to conceal any knowledge of this secret attack, but zealous friends impressed upon the cardinal that Colbert had become bitterly hostile to Fouquet and wanted his place; there might have been irregularities in some of the methods used, but they had

[1] This plan, which was occasionally modified as friends and circumstances changed, is published in Lettres, etc., de Colbert, t. ii., Int. 20-30.

[2] Lettres de Colbert, vii., 164–183.

been necessary from the pressing need for money, and any attempt at radical change at this time, or the removal of Fouquet, would make it impossible to raise the money which would be instantly needed for the expenses of the king's wedding; it would be an inglorious ending to the Peace of the Pyrenees if Louis did not have enough ready money to go and meet his bride.

Mazarin insisted that no more taxes should be farmed, unless they were first submitted to him, and thus the matter was left. Fouquet judiciously saw to it that the farms for 1660 realized better figures for the state, and Mazarin wrote expressing his gratification and complimenting the superintendent's ability.[1] The cardinal was in declining health and busy with foreign politics, but still Fouquet felt his position was not free from danger. Colbert said, that if Mazarin had lived he would soon have removed Fouquet, and this seems to be probable.[2] At all events, the superintendent's spies haunted the chamber of the sick minister, sending frequent reports of his condition, and holding out encouragement that his end was near at hand. They endeavored in vain to penetrate the secret of the long interviews of the king with the dying man, in which it was known that he gave his final advice as to the policy which Louis should pursue.

After Mazarin's death Fouquet hoped that he might succeed to his power. But Colbert had been recommended by the cardinal to the confidence of Louis, XIV. Six months afterwards, Fouquet was suddenly arrested, and he atoned, by spending the remaining nineteen years of his life in rigorous confinement, for his splendor and his corruption while in power.[3]

---

[1] Mazarin à Fouquet, Feb. 4 and 14, 1660. [2] Lettres de Colbert, ii., 32, 33.

[3] The authorities for Fouquet's career are very full; the most of those of importance have been published. Those on which I have relied are chiefly found in Lettres, Instructions, etc., de Colbert, t. i., ii., and vii. Journal d' Ormesson, t. ii.; Letters and other papers published in Cheruel's "Mémoires sur Fouquet"; the Mss. papers at the Bibliothèque Nationale; and the voluminous papers published, containing the evidence and proceedings of the trial. Some valuable, although not very exact, information is found in Mémoires de Gourville.

The Peace of the Pyrenees left France triumphant abroad, and Mazarin triumphant at home. If his enemies abused him in private, they no longer raised their voices in public against the all-powerful minister. Internal dissension seemed to have ceased, and even the Prince of Condé had at last been tamed. The process had occupied almost twenty years, but it had been accomplished. The prince made a formal apology to the king for his past misconduct, and he wrote Mazarin asking the cardinal to believe him his faithful servant, and to grant him his affection.[1] He accompanied Louis in the frequent visits that were made to the minister during his long illness; he visited the Louvre assiduously, and he became a zealous and submissive courtier.[2] The only rebel that was still left against the authority of Mazarin and Louis XIV. was a vagrant archbishop.

There were many important political questions which Mazarin had not attempted to regulate at the Island of the Pheasants, and he now gave his attention to restoring peace to other lands. The influence of France was such that she took a great part in every important negotiation in Europe. Her envoys were treating by the Baltic for peace between Sweden, Poland, and the powers of the North; her ships were sailing to aid the Venetians in their contest with the Great Turk. Portugal, Lorraine, England, every nation or prince involved in war or embarrassment, sought from France assistance or relief, and this vast field of negotiations, which involved the interests of almost every European power, was directed by Mazarin with industry, with sagacity, and with an unfailing zeal for the country of his adoption. He could justly say that if his speech was not French, his heart was.[3]

[1] Condé à Mazarin, Dec. 24, 1659, printed in Lenet.

[2] Mém. de Tarente, 236.

[3] Mazarin à Servien, Aff. Etr. Ang., 59. That Mazarin himself felt convinced that he was a valuable servant to France, and was willing to leave his conduct to the judgment of posterity, appears in many private memoranda. "Whatever misfortune befalls me," he wrote a very intimate friend, in 1651, "history will tell only what is good of me, if it tells the truth."

Mazarin was anxious to terminate the war which for some years had raged in the north of Europe, but the ungovernable ambition of Charles Gustavus had declined terms of peace. Poland, Denmark, Brandenburg, and even Austria had all become involved in the wars excited by Sweden, and it seemed possible that under the provisions of the treaty of Westphalia, France might be obliged to interfere and protect the Swedes in the possession of Pomerania. If this became necessary, Mazarin said France would furnish not only money, but a powerful army for the support of her former ally, but he sought to avoid this and bring Sweden to accept reasonable terms of peace. The death of Charles Gustavus rendered this more easy. Treaties were made between Sweden, Denmark, Poland, and Brandenburg, by which all of them were left in nearly the same condition as when they had begun their wars. The execution of most of these treaties was guaranteed by Louis XIV., and it was formally declared that by his intervention peace had been restored.[1]

Even the relations of Poland and Russia received Mazarin's care, and a few months after his death the treaty of peace was made between them for which he had labored. Venice had long been promised aid in her war with Turkey, when France should be free from other complications, and in 1660 a small fleet sailed from Toulon to the assistance of the Venetians in Candia. It was commanded by a prince of Modena, but he died during the expedition, and its results were not important.

Duke Charles of Lorraine having tormented Don Luis de Haro, without obtaining any thing further from Spain, now supplicated the French Court to grant him better terms. He proceeded in his negotiations with the same fertility of devices in which he had indulged before his five years' imprisonment. Though he was well stricken in years, and well provided with those who claimed to be his wives, he suggested to Mazarin that he would like to

[1] Dumont, Corps Dip., t. vi., 2d part, 304, *et seq.*

marry one of his nieces, and would also like to have the Duchy of Bar restored to him. The cardinal replied that the duke was mistaken in supposing that he made alliances for his nieces at the expense of the interests of France.[1] But many members of the House of Lorraine had become influential members of the French aristocracy. They gained some favors for their kinsman, and in February, 1661, a new treaty restored Bar to Lorraine. But it was to be held as a fief of the French crown. The fortifications of Nancy were to be destroyed, a considerable portion of the duchy was annexed to France, and Lorraine was to be open for the passage of troops to Alsace. On such terms the Duke of Lorraine was restored to what remained of his ancient possessions.

France took no part in the restoration of the Stuarts, though the return of Charles II. to power was viewed with favor, and was justly regarded as a political change which would be advantageous to the interests of Louis XIV. An alliance between Charles and one of Mazarin's nieces had been suggested as a means of obtaining the cardinal's support, but without success. After he was restored to the throne, his mother, Henriette Marie of France, still favored such a marriage, if the cardinal would make the king heir to the bulk of his fortune. The plan was not agreeable to Charles, and it was presently dropped, but Mazarin gave secret assistance to the negotiations for a marriage of the king with Catharine of Portugal. Such an alliance was viewed with apprehension by the Spanish, and to assist its accomplishment was hardly consistent with the secret article by which France agreed to give no further aid to Portugal. That agreement did not, however, interfere with the course which France pursued, nor with her subsequently doing still more for her former ally. Treaties were viewed with as much indifference in the seventeenth as in the eighteenth century. Louis XIV. wrote afterwards of these negotiations, that he saw that the Portuguese, deprived of his assistance, could not resist

[1] Mazarin à Lorraine, July 4, 1660.

the House of Austria, and having some scruples about assisting them openly, on account of the Peace of the Pyrenees, he wished to lend his aid under the name of the king of England. "Not but that I know well," he adds, "that treaties are not always observed to the letter, and that the interests of crowns are such that the princes who are charged with them are not always at liberty to bind themselves to their prejudice."[1]

Mazarin's health had been infirm for some time and it now began to fail rapidly. His constitution was naturally good and he was only fifty-nine years of age, but the enormous amount of work which he did was thought to have impaired his vigor, and the long stay at the Isle of Pheasants, during the hot weather of 1659, had perhaps increased the maladies from which he suffered.[2] The condition of his health had not interfered with his diplomatic work in 1660, and among other diversions for his sufferings, Moliére's Précieuses Ridicules was acted before him in his chamber.[3] But early in 1661 his condition grew rapidly worse, and his physicians advised him that his end was near. The cardinal had been fond of the things of this world, of its pleasures as well as its power, but even his enemies admitted that he met death with extraordinary calmness.[4]

He gave, at much length, his last counsels for the government of Louis XIV. He advised the king to take upon himself the chief direction of his affairs, to limit the Parliament to the administration of justice, and to reduce the taille and other impositions, so far as the necessary expenses of the government would allow. He advised Louis also to avail himself of Colbert's services in

[1] Mém. de Louis XIV. ii., 406–8.

[2] Bussy Rabutin, ii., 107.

[3] Loret, Oct., 1660.

[4] Bussy Rabutin, ii., 107; Mém de Tarente; Motteville, 503. I attach no importance to the statement of the younger Brienne, that he heard Mazarin walking among his pictures and statuary and lamenting that he must leave all these and that he should see them no more where he was going. The younger Brienne prepared his reminiscences in a mad-house, and they show marks of a fervid imagination.

the finances of France, and to exercise a careful control over the operations of Fouquet.[1]

Mazarin had never shown a strong religious character, but at the end he manifested an apparent and probably a sincere devotion. His nature was not one to be deeply affected by the conception of religious truth, but neither was it one that would indulge in sceptical doubts as to the ordinarily accepted belief. He received the extreme unction with contrition, and died professing a firm religious confidence.

Cardinal Mazarin died on March 9, 1661. For eighteen years he had been the ruler of the kingdom, and his administration had been of the same duration as that of Richelieu. He had done much for the power and glory of France and little for the happiness of her people.

His loss was sincerely regretted by Louis XIV., and the king, when he began acting as his own chief minister, followed implicitly the instructions which he had received from Mazarin.

The cardinal on his death-bed offered to leave his fortune to the king. The offer was, perhaps, prompted by the feeling that it had largely been accumulated at the expense of the royal treasury, but Mazarin may have been willing also to have his last act appear as an extraordinary and magnificent donation to the country he had ruled.[2] It was declined, as Mazarin probably expected that it would be. The amount of the fortune he left was not known, and an inventory was forbidden, but it was estimated at 30,000,000 livres, a sum which in purchasing power would represent twenty-five or thirty million dollars now. These figures are probably somewhat exaggerated. The most authentic figures as to his fortune are in a statement prepared by Colbert in 1658. They show that at that time it was somewhat less than 8,000,000 livres. His income, in-

[1] Mazarin's advice, except in reference to Colbert and Fouquet, was reduced to writing under the king's own dictation. Let. de Colbert, i., 535, 536; ii., 33.

[2] Such is not the account given by the Abbé of Choisi, but the Abbé's statements do not by any means imply absolute verity.

cluding his pensions and livings, was about 800,000 livres.[1] This estimate did not include his collections of art, his jewels, or the offices or governments which he held, and which passed to his heirs. His fortune, also, was largely increased after 1658, but it was probably overestimated. Whatever its size, it was an enormous one to have accumulated in the public service, and is a stain upon Mazarin's memory. He might have urged in mitigation of the offence, that he lived in a period of almost universal public corruption, and that it was not his greed, but his opportunity, which exceeded that of most of his contemporaries.

He gave donations to some charities and friends. He ratified the provisions he had already made for the erection and endowment of the College of Four Nations for scholars from Roussillon, Artois, Alsace, and Piedmont. But nearly the whole of his fortune was given to his family. His nephew had the Duchy of Nevers, his nieces each received 600,000 livres or more, and the bulk of his estate was given to the husband of Hortense Mancini, who took the title of Duke of Mazarin and was selected as the cardinal's heir.[2]

The family of Mazarin were so involved, not only with his own fortunes, but with the political history of the time, that something may properly be said about their varied careers.[3] The two nephews on whom Mazarin had built his hopes died young, and the third was not a favorite of his uncle. He had little application and no ambition, and his only passions were an immoderate fondness for travel and a strong taste for rhymes. A wandering poet was not what the cardinal desired for the inheritor of his name, and Philip Mancini was not made his heir. As he was left the Duchy of Nevers, which was one of the most beautiful in France, a palace in Rome, and part of Maz-

[1] This paper was prepared in Colbert's own handwriting. It is published in Lettres de Colbert, i., 520–530. Saint Simon says Mazarin left 60,000,000 livres.

[2] The will is printed in Œuvres de Louis XIV., vi., 292–345.

[3] All the facts about Mazarin's family are collected in M. Renée's entertaining book, "Les Niéces de Mazarin."

arin's palace and collections in Paris, his condition was not as bad as that of most disinherited nephews. Free from the ambitious and violent passions of his sisters, the Duke of Nevers travelled a large part of his life, turned off poetry of no great value, disturbed no one, and derived, perhaps, more enjoyment from his fortune than any other of those who shared in Mazarin's wealth.

Philip's two cousins, the Martinozzi, filled with dignity and virtue the positions that were selected for them. One of them was married to Conti, and though the prince had shown little interest in the question of which niece he should obtain, he seems to have lived very amicably with the one that was allotted to him. His wife had been selected for the Duke of Candale, and as the duke was the delight of all eyes, and the prince had more rank than beauty, she was not desirous for the change. But the cardinal did not consult his nieces as to the political combinations of which their marriages were parts, and the Princess of Conti accepted the husband awarded her with a good grace. She developed a strong religious character, sold her jewels in a time of famine and gave the proceeds to the poor, and succeeded in making a saint of her husband. He died young, and his widow devoted her life to religion, and was closely united with Mme. de Longueville in a common zeal for the Port Royal.

Her sister, Laura Martinozzi, filled a still more dignified position. Married to the Duke of Modena, his death left her, when still a young woman, the regent of that duchy. For twelve years she governed this little state with a good judgment worthy of her uncle. Her rule was a mild one. Her subjects enjoyed tranquillity and were treated with justice. But the niece of Mazarin was statesmanlike as well as peaceable. She was always firm in her alliance with France, furnished her contingent to the expedition which Louis XIV. sent to Candia, and even started a little war of her own against the Duchess of Mantua, who was endeavoring to seize some small islands in the Po that were claimed as the property of Modena.

The Spanish government quieted the strife of the warring duchesses. The daughter of the Duchess of Modena became the second wife of the Duke of York, and the blood of the Mazarins flowed in the veins of the Stuart pretenders to the English crown. The mother saw her daughter a queen, and was spared the pain of seeing her an exile.

The oldest of the Mancini was a character as estimable as her cousins. The Duke of Mercœur, who bore little resemblance to his turbulent father and his equally turbulent sons, seems to have desired Laura Mancini for his wife, whatever her uncle's fate might be, and he gallantly kept his plighted word and married her when the cardinal was in exile. The abundant honors he enjoyed after Mazarin's return showed that he made no mistake even from a worldly standpoint, and his wife herself proved all that he hoped. But she died young, and her husband, in his bereavement, abandoned the worldly prosperity he had gained. He became a priest, discharged his religious duties with zeal and piety, and before his death was made a cardinal.

The younger Mancini had wilder blood in their veins, and their charms, their adventures, and their vices made them known over Europe. Olympe was the playmate and friend of Louis XIV., and the courtiers said that she might find herself on the throne of France. Such was not her fortune, but she was married to a prince of the House of Savoy, and became the Countess of Soissons. Louis continued his friendship after her marriage, and the Hotel of Soissons was one of the centres of the gayeties of the Court, but its pleasures were by no means entirely innocent. The countess was fond of Court intrigues and love intrigues, and her husband was thought to show a childlike confidence, in the extreme affability with which he treated all of his wife's friends. The count died, and Olympe became involved in the charges of poisoning that grew out of the affair of La Voisin. It was said, perhaps with more truth, that she had a taste for magic and necromancers, and had consulted one of these as to the means for

regaining the affection of a great prince, who, perhaps, was Louis himself. At all events, she claimed that Louvois and other powerful enemies were resolved to ruin her, and she fled from France. Such charges were believed by the vulgar, and at many of the places through which she passed, the people hooted at the poisoner and sorceress. Louïs XIV. became hostile to his old playmate, and she was never allowed to return to France. She wandered about Spain and the Low Countries, and died after almost thirty years of exile and disgrace. One of her sons was Prince Eugene of Savoy. He inherited the talents of his mother's family, as well as the warlike qualities of the House of Savoy, and when he won the victories that crippled the power and humiliated the pride of Louis XIV., his mother may have felt that she was avenged on France and its king.

The next sister was Marie Mancini, whom Louis XIV. wished to marry, and who came so near to being the queen of France. The precepts of Seneca, which her uncle recommended for her disappointment, did not entirely govern her future life, and she had an extraordinary and reckless career. Mazarin insisted on marrying her to the Constable Colonna, though she protested bitterly against being sent away from France. The cardinal seems to have been specially severe towards this niece, who dared to thwart his desires, and endeavored to prevent the Peace of the Pyrenees. Fearful that she might disobey his wish, the only provision he left her by his will was the dowry she was to have on marrying Colonna. To Rome, therefore, she was obliged to go, and become the wife of this Italian nobleman. It is said that when her husband showed her his palace, he pointed out a room as the chamber of her grandfather, when he was *maitre de chambre* for his grandfather. Marie replied that she did not know about her grandfather, but she knew well that she had made the poorest match of any of her sisters.

Even if the constable was thus discourteous at the beginning, he and his wife for some years lived in amity.

In her palace, unlike the grave decorum which prevailed in most Italian palaces, there were always comedies, dancing, gambling, and all the pleasures of Paris. But she was little fitted for domestic life. Some of her conduct was reckless and some was scandalous. Colonna became jealous of his wife, and the wife became weary of Colonna. One day she and her sister disguised themselves as men, fled from Rome, and sailed in a little boat from Civita Vecchia, hotly pursued by the constable's galleys and by some Turkish corsairs. Marie would have regarded capture by the Turks as the lesser evil, but she escaped both. Once in France she made her way to Paris, but the Prince of Orange was no more embarrassing a neighbor to Louis XIV. than one of the Mancini, and the king ordered her sent away. She was imprisoned for a while in the Low Countries, and then rejoined her husband in Spain, where he treated her with no greater severity than occasionally shutting her up in a convent. With beauty and wit, but no common-sense, Marie found life grow harder for her, and before her death her existence had become very obscure. It was certainly not happy, and probably not edifying.

Next to Marie came Hortense Mancini, who was thought the most beautiful of the family. Her uncle was fond of her, and decided to choose a husband for her who should inherit the most of his fortune. There were many suitors for such a bride. Charles II. wanted to marry her before he was restored, and his mother wanted him to marry her after he was restored. The brother of the King of Portugal, and the Duke of Savoy were among the great alliances that were suggested. But Mazarin was inclined to choose some French nobleman who would assume and perpetuate his name. He thought of the Marshal of Turenne, but Turenne had an illustrious name which he would not abandon, and he had fifty years, which the young Hortense did not wish to accept. There was some suggestion of the last scion of the Courtenays, who was of the blood of the Capets, whose ancestors had sat

on the throne of Constantinople, and who had the longest pedigree and the shortest purse of any nobleman in France. But notwithstanding so illustrious a lineage, it was decided that he was too impecunious to receive the richest bride in Europe.

After much consideration, Mazarin made the most unfortunate choice that was possible. He selected the young La Meilleraie, whose father was a duke, and a man of large wealth, and who, though of no ancient lineage, was a kinsman of Richelieu. Perhaps, the last circumstance decided the choice. La Meilleraie obtained the bride, who was beautiful, and the fortune, which was immense, and he took the title of the Duke of Mazarin. Very soon after the cardinal's death, the duke began to display his eccentricities. He was afflicted with a species of religious insanity which showed itself, among other ways, in a modesty of unusual rigor. The great collection of statuary and paintings, of which he had become the owner, shocked his views, and armed with a hammer he went through the galleries, demolishing the statues that offended him by an improper nudity, while Titians and Corregios were smeared over, wherever the dress of the beauties, or the Magdalens, which the masters had painted, was not such as would be appropriate at a prayer meeting. Colbert succeeded in checking this destruction, but the collection suffered severely from the piety of its owner. He was equally strict with the creatures of flesh and blood. He went about the villages, seeking to teach the country girls to adopt positions while churning or spinning which should always be severely modest.

Hortense suffered from such vagaries and from many others. Her husband saw visions and dreamed dreams. They all suggested some new way to make life disagreeable for his wife. Often she rushed into the streets in tears, displaying the family skeletons to the public, and at last she took refuge with her brother. The duke went to law to recover possession of his wife. A taste for lawsuits was another of his peculiarities. He was said to have had

three hundred, and to have lost almost all. He succeeded in seriously impairing his fortune by his interminable litigations, and thus, it has been said, the Fronde at last had its revenge on Mazarin, and the wealth of the cardinal was scattered among the judges and lawyers of the Parliament. Hortense feared so resolute a litigant. She disguised herself as a man and galloped through France, until she found safety in Lorraine. There she enjoyed the favor of its duke, but presently she wandered to Rome and joined her sister Marie, when she also fled from her husband. At last Hortense chose London for her home, and after having refused Charles II. for a husband she accepted him as a lover. She received a pension from the king. Her husband, who had gained much legal knowledge, sent formal notice that his wife's receipts would be of no legal validity, but Charles replied that as he never took any receipts, that was of little importance. Her life at the English Court was galling to the Duke of Mazarin, and he was restless at being deprived of a lawsuit. "If she has an ounce of courage," he said, "let her return and dispute the matter with me in the courts." The duke made many endeavors to induce his wife to come back to the pious home she had left, but her answer to all overtures was the watchword of the Fronde—"No Mazarin."

The favorite niece and the heiress of Mazarin died a wanderer in England in 1699.

Marie Anne Mancini, the last of the nieces, led a less turbulent life. She was married to the Duke of Bouillon, a nephew of Turenne's. He was fond of hunting and she was fond of society; he chased deer and wolves, and at last went off to fight the Turks; she was devoted to balls, ballets, conversations, and intrigues; they saw little of each other, and lived in entire amity. The duchess was one of the leaders of the party which endeavored to crush Racine, and when the *Phèdre* was represented she spent 15,000 livres hiring men to hiss. Racine triumphed over his adversaries, and the combat was abandoned. The duchess had several sons who

all showed a valor in the field worthy of their ancestry. But most of the families with which the blood of the Mazarins was mingled became extinct in a few generations. Such was the fate of the Stuarts, the Vendômes, the Estes, the Contis, the Soissons, and the Bouillons. Fortune, which so steadily favored the Cardinal Mazarin, was less constant to the family for which he had labored to prepare so brilliant a destiny.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE ADMINISTRATION AND THE CONDITION OF THE PEOPLE.

THE nature of the French government at this period has, to some extent, been shown. For nearly forty years, two successive chief ministers exercised an almost absolute authority. No session of the States-General interfered with it, and the endeavors of the Parliament to restrain and annul the edicts of the king, in whose name the chief minister acted, proved unsuccessful.

Another institution possessed much dignity but little power, and that was the council of the king. Under different forms the king's council is found during the whole history of the French monarchy, consisting of nobles and great dignitaries, who, as the king's advisers, would naturally exercise much authority in matters to which he would not give his personal attention. Louis XIII. by his last edict had endeavored to establish a council to which the government of the country should be entrusted during his son's minority. But such an effort was claimed to be contrary to the institutions of the kingdom, and the royal council, under whatever shape it was organized, was never a body of importance in the state.

Neither a king nor a chief minister could, however, control all the details of the government, and in the seventeenth century a great power was exercised by a few officials, whose positions had formerly been of small importance. Four secretaries, among the large number of those who wrote for the king, had been charged with the correspondence for public affairs, and were called Secre-

taries of State.[1] Their authority gradually increased, until each of them had charge of all correspondence with one quarter of the provinces of France, and with one fourth of the foreign nations with which France had relations. By a more orderly division of their duties under Richelieu, one of these secretaries had assigned to him the affairs of war, a second those of the marine, a third took charge of foreign affairs, and a fourth, of the private estate of the king and matters of the church. The four Secretaries of State became, with the Chancellor and Superintendent of Finances, the most important officers in the kingdom.[2] In 1643 Guénégaud paid the Count of Brienne 750,000 livres for his position as Secretary of State, the equivalent of nearly a million dollars now.[3] The king could remove a secretary from the exercise of his duties, and only by his consent could a new secretary acquire the position, but like almost all other offices, its holder had paid for it, and only on receiving just compensation could he be required to surrender his title.

The office of the Superintendent of Finance was of still more importance, and the control he had over the revenues, together with the confusion that existed in them, gave him an opportunity for acquiring great wealth. La Vieuville, who was removed by Richelieu, gained a large fortune by corrupt practices. Bullion, who was superintendent under the cardinal, left a property, the income of which was 500,000 livres.[4] Emeri's conduct in the office made him the most hated man in France, and abuses, carelessness, and corruption were carried to the greatest extent by Fouquet. No budget of the receipts or expenses of the government was prepared. The superintendent rendered no account. The condition of the finances was not only kept secret from the people, but it was impossible, even for those who had charge of

[1] The number of the royal secretaries increased, until while there were three under St. Louis, there were 245 at the time of Colbert.

[2] Fauvelet du Toc: "Histoire des Secrétaires d'État," 1678. Caillet: "L' Administration sous Richelieu," chapter 2.

[3] Journal d' Ormesson, i., 9. [4] Lettre d'Arnault à Barillon, Dec. 26, 1640.

them, to ascertain it with accuracy. Over 100,000,000 livres a year were received and paid out, without any accounts or book-keeping deserving of the name. It was not until Colbert that an orderly system was introduced into the finances, and the result was at once an enormous improvement in their condition.

These various official positions, whose importance constantly increased, were, under Louis XIII. and still more under Louis XIV., entrusted to commoners. While certain positions about the Court were held by nobles, the offices of responsibility were mostly held by those of inferior birth. It was one of Saint Simon's most frequent complaints at the close of Louis XIV.'s reign, that plebeians held great positions and acquired by them wealth and an influence that should belong only to those of noble ancestry.[1] This tendency is found both under Richelieu and Mazarin, and here, as in many other respects, Louis XIV. followed their traditions. Richelieu said he wanted for the management of the finances persons, neither of too high, nor too low degree, of good reputation so far as possible, not gentlemen of the sword, but of the robe, because their pretensions would be less.

The superintendent had by no means the entire control of the financial system. Different treasurers disbursed the monies received from different sources of taxation. During some years under Richelieu and Mazarin, nearly one half of all the monies paid out were accounted for in one lump as "acquits à comptant," monies paid by the king's special order. In the four years from 1655 to 1659, 320,000,000 livres were paid out in this manner.[2] Under a cover which prevented examination, there was every facility for fraud. The salary of the treasurer for direct taxes was only 3,000 livres, but the office ordinarily sold for 2,-

[1] These complaints are scattered all through the long and valuable memoirs of Saint Simon. Though his own family had not long belonged to the aristocracy, he exhibits in the strongest degree the feelings of that body.

[2] Lettres de Colbert, ii., 29.

000,000.[1] "When I was treasurer," one of Orleans' servants said to the duke, "I became a robber like all the rest." The collection and disbursement of the revenues was intrusted to an enormous number of officials, largely independent of each other, and constituting a most costly and ineffective system.

The manner in which payments were made also furnished an opportunity for great gains. There was rarely any money on hand, and the creditor received an order upon the fund to be derived from some particular tax. Orders were often outstanding for many times the amount which the fund would receive during the year, and that condition of affairs furnished an easy excuse for delaying payments. The orders were sold at a great discount, and in the hands of the officers of finance, or their friends, were promptly paid with a great profit. The advances to the government, at rates of from ten to twenty-five per cent., were often made by those who had charge of the collection of the taxes.[2] So irregular were the returns of taxes, that the government sometimes borrowed its own money.[3] One officer received 120,000 livres for interest on advances to the government, but at last it was found that he was in arrears for 1,700,000 livres of taxes which he had collected, but had not as yet paid over.[4] From such practices, from the high rates of interest paid by the government, and from the insufficient amounts received for the taxes which were farmed, the enormous fortunes were ac-

[1] Plumatif de la Chambre des Comptes, 2759, 2760. I should express my obligation to M. le Vicomte d'Avenel, who in his valuable book on "Richelieu et la Monarchie Absolue" has printed a great number of important documents, and by his references has furnished a guide to others in their examination.

[2] The average rate of interest paid by the government for advances on taxes was at least fifteen per cent. Let. de Maz., iii., 159. Dis. Ven., cviii., 30, *et pas.* Talon, 271, 300. Journal du Parlement, 17. Lettres et Inst. de Colbert, ii., 23. Occasional partial repudiations reduced the rate temporarily. In 1639, 1648, and 1660, arbitrary reductions of one quarter or more were made on the interest to be paid, and similar reductions were frequent. The government, however, profited little by them, and claims for arrears, bought very low, were often redeemed in full.

[3] Lettres de Richelieu, ii., 209.

[4] Mém. de Richelieu, i., 201.

cumulated which made the financiers the richest and the most hated class in France. The oppressions which they often practised added to the ill-will caused by their great gains. Having paid the government less than could be justly collected from a duty, they extracted from the people more than was imposed. Lambert, an officer of the treasury, died leaving 5,000,000. Galand, a well-known financier, was said to have left 12,000,000. Bordier, the son of a tallow chandler, gave 800,000 livres to his daughter on her marriage, and spent as much more on his house. Boyer and Bonneau left their children over a million a piece. Bazinière, the son of a peasant, began life as a lackey, became a financier, and left 4,000,000 livres.[1] A young Hollander on his visit to Paris, in 1657, speaks of the fairy-like beauty and splendor of the residences and palaces of the financiers. Their daughters married into the great families of a very exclusive aristocracy, and the widow of Galaud was left so rich, that it was complained a president of Parliament was not ashamed to marry her.[2]

An edict of 1661 established a chamber of justice to investigate and punish all the frauds that had been committed in the finances of the government since 1635.[3] The chamber proceeded with vigor in its work. The finances were now under the control of Colbert, and there were neither disorders within nor wars without to check or harass the administration. A settlement was at last made by the payment, by the various parties accused, of 110,000,000 livres; 60,000,000 in money and 50,000,000 in rentes; and the sum thus refunded represented but a moderate proportion of the frauds of twenty-five years.[4]

---

[1] Tallemant, iv., 110.

[2] Journal d'Ormesson, i., 238, 304, 312. Lettres de Richelieu, viii., 33. Lettres de Patin, i., 350. Choix des Mazarinades, i., 113–140. This pamphlet occupies twenty-seven pages with a list of the financiers and their supposed gains. Journal d'un Voyage à Paris en 1657, 39. The Venetian ambassador said: "La maggiore parte delle richezze della Francia sono nelle mani dei partitanti." Relazioni, Francia, t. ii., 539.

[3] Anc. lois françaises, xviii., 12–15.

[4] Journal d'Ormesson, ii., 400.

Amid such practices, the expenses of the government were irregularly paid. Even the king was not unfrequently in need of ready money. His personal expenses, the civil list proper, were from three to four million livres a year; not an excessive sum compared with the wastefulness in other directions.[1] These were largely increased by the great number of officials who formed part of the royal household, and were fed and paid by the king. There were five hundred officers for the table and as many for the chamber, for here, as everywhere, the amounts received from the sale of offices had led to their indefinite multiplication.[2] The Court was more lavish under the regent than under Louis XIII. and the expenses were over 4,000,000 a year. Mazarin drew from 1641 to 1648, over 8,000,000 livres, but the accounts of the ministers were so confounded with those of the state, and with the monies they advanced for it, that it is impossible to say how much of this great sum was for his own expenses and the magnificence which he supported.[3]

During the thirty-six years which were covered by the administrations of Richelieu and Mazarin, France was at war, almost without intermission. The necessities of these wars increased the burdens of taxation and caused much of the misery from which the country suffered.

The condition of the army was the most important matter for the government, and that the army was often ill-disciplined, ill-paid, and ineffective is the strongest evidence of the financial needs, and of the faulty organization, of the administration. The irregularities that prevailed in the army under Richelieu, have already beeen referred to, and we find the same under Mazarin, but aggravated by the troubles of the Fronde.

The armies seem moderate in size when compared with those of modern times, but then they could be equalled by no other European nation. Over one hundred and

[1] See Mss. Godefroy: Caisse Centrale de l' Epargne, published by D' Avenel.

[2] Arch. Nat. K. K., 201.

[3] Compte de l' argent reçu et payé par le banquier Contarini.

fifty thousand men were under arms in some of the campaigns of Richelieu.[1] The exhaustion of the parties and the limitation of the field of war by the Peace of Westphalia diminished this number, and the armies of France during Mazarin's administration never reached that figure.[2] Both modern rules of strategy and modern means of warfare were largely developed during these wars. At the beginning of them the soldiers were still partially encumbered by the defensive armor of the middle ages. Bombs were first used by the French in 1634 at the siege of La Motte.[3] Their fire-arms were imperfect, and the bayonet was not attached to the gun. The lack of discipline, which so often turned the soldiers into armed robbers, was not due wholly to the irregularity of pay. Even the fact that they were not furnished with uniforms, and generally had no distinctive dress, was not without its effect.[4] It was said that the French did not shoot as accurately as the Spaniards. They resembled the armies of Napoleon in their desire for a spirited leadership, and it was claimed that one Frenchman in an attack, was worth as much as three on the defensive.[5]

The pay of the soldiers was good when compared with that received by common laborers. It varied from four to seven sous a day.[6] Some English soldiers furnished by Cromwell in 1657 were to be paid eight sous a day and furnished with bread, and it was feared that even that would not be enough to support those coming from that flesh-eating nation.[7]

But, unfortunately, the wages that were promised were not always paid. The government did not undertake to furnish supplies, as is done with modern armies, and the soldiers without pay and without rations were obliged to

[1] See his letters before cited. [2] Relazioni Venete, Francia, ii., 505–536.

[3] Tallemant des Réaux, ii., 185. Mercure, xx., 158, 164.

[4] La Misère au Temps de la Fronde, 73.

[5] Mém. de Richelieu, xxiii., 216, 248.

[6] Molé, i., 487. Journal d' un Bourgeois de Marle. *passim*. This would be 8 to 14 sous a day in present French money.

[7] Journal d' un Voyage à Paris en 1657, 180. "Nation carnassière."

resort to pillage. The soldiers of Erlach having received no pay for eight months revolted and even threatened to kill their officers.[1] Those under Weimar in Alsace, without pay or rations, deserted their companies, and pillaged the country until they were gorged with booty.[2]

"There is no doubt the province will be ruined by our troops," Harcourt writes from Normandy in 1649. "We have not a sou, and we are in such extremity that if we punish those who pillage, we shall lose many good soldiers, who have had no pay for ten months and cannot subsist except by plunder."[3] "If charity and justice," a superintendent writes from Turin, "do not supply succor to our troops, who are without money, rations, arms, and shoes, prudence should not allow those to perish whom we need against enemies both within and without."[4]

The navy was of less importance than the army in the wars that were raging, and it received less attention. Richelieu, however, took an especial interest in the navy and the development of a merchant marine. Though he was largely absorbed in other things during the later years of his administration, the naval strength of France was considerably developed by his exertions. It was insignificant when he began his ministry. Even at La Rochelle, in 1628, we find the French fleet consisting of only twenty-five ships of five hundred tons burthen.[5] It was largely increased after that siege. In 1640 the fleet consisted of seventy-six, and in 1642 of eighty-five sail. The Venetian ambassador estimates the fleet in 1641 at as much as one hundred ships. Only two or three of them were over one thousand tons burthen. The expenses of the marine amounted to 3,000,000 livres.[6] Richelieu endeavored, also,

[1] Let. de Mazarin, i., 669.

[2] Mém. de Bassompierre, 350.

[3] Arch. Nat. K. K. Ms., 1083., 150.

[4] Letter of Servient to Seguier, May 29, 1649. The official correspondence and the memoirs of this period are full of similar complaints.

[5] Fontenay Mareuil, 205.

[6] See État de la Marine, t. 42, Sup. Dupuy. États Statisques de la Marine, in Documents Inédits, Correspondance de Sourdis, iii., 359–527. Relazioni Venete, Francia, ii., 348.

to furnish assistance for the merchant ships against pirates, and to increase the coast guards. The navy suffered, however, under Mazarin after 1647. His attention was so absorbed in foreign politics that he often neglected the internal interests in France, nor indeed was he at all familiar with what was required for the internal development of that kingdom. But the disorders caused by the Fronde were such, that it was impossible to attend to many interests which required money and order. While the cardinal is entitled to the credit for the successful termination of the wars of France by two great treaties which increased her territory and added to her prestige in Europe, the blame for many disorders which temporarily checked the prosperity of the people should be borne in equal degree by those who kept the country for five years involved in civil war. Some of Richelieu's measures, by their severity, had defeated their ends. He declared that a sailor who served for one year in the navy belonged forever to the service of the king. Mazarin judiciously allowed them to take service again on merchant ships.[1]

A few ships were constructed in 1655, one of them of two thousand tons burthen, and Mazarin gave careful instructions as to their equipment and the pay and care of the sailors.[2]

But in 1661 there were only twenty-two vessels of war, and but 1,045 cannon for them.[3] The navy had been reduced by fully one half, and the ships that still remained were in bad repair. The amount spent on the navy in 1656 was only 312,000 livres.[4] Two hundred years later France spent 160,000,000 francs on her navy, or over eighty times as much.

The condition of commerce and trade was little more flourishing. The efforts made to reëstablish French com-

[1] Ord. March 4, 1643.

[2] Aff. Etr. France, 8 95., 19, 33, *et pas.*

[3] Lettres de Colbert, ii., 50. États des Batiments, Sept., 1661. *Ib.*, iii., 699, 700. It should be remembered, however, that all of those reckoned under Richelieu were not strictly vessels of war.

[4] Comptes Rendus, par Mallet.

merce on the Mediterranean were not accompanied by any large degree of success. Manufactures and internal commerce were greatly hampered by the complicated customs duties which divided France and made its different provinces regarded as foreign nations to each other, and by the countless regulations and restrictions on trade. The exchange of products even within the kingdom was checked, and in some parts almost prohibited, by the number of local tolls, both on land and water, to which it was subjected. Goods from Havre to Paris paid local duties or tolls at Rouen, Andelys, Vernon, Roche Guyon, Mantes, Meulan, Poissy, Conflans, Maisons, and St. Denis. They then paid at Paris duties on river gate and ban.[1] There were twenty-eight different tolls on the river Loire. Besides several thousand legal tolls and duties, many were imposed that were illegal. Some local governor would forbid the passage of wheat from his district to another, in order to compel the owners to pay him for a passport for its transportation.[2] Even without such impositions, the carriage of goods was so expensive from the badness of the roads, that it was not practicable for any long distance, except by water.

The difficulty in the exchange of products caused great differences of price in different parts of the kingdom. Wheat would be selling much lower in Picardy than at La Rochelle.[3] Provisions, wine, or cider would be at very low prices in one district, and be very dear in another twenty or thirty leagues away. The farmers and dealers would leave crops to perish rather than attempt to transport them even that distance, and pay the numerous and uncertain duties which would be imposed at different places on the route.[4] The cost of transportation on bulky articles was very great. To bring a barrel of codfish from the coast of Normandy to Paris cost seven livres, or as much as eight dollars now.[5] A pound of salt which cost

[1] Mss. Bibl. Nat., 18,510, f. 193.
[2] Let. de Colbert, i., 210.
[3] *Ib.*, 316.
[4] Disme Royale, 32.
[5] D'Avenel, ii., 261.

two sous at Rochelle, would cost twenty-five sous when it had reached Paris.[1]

Not only different measures used in almost every city, but different rates of duty imposed in almost every province, added to the uncertainties. A measure of brandy paid a tax of six livres at Rouen, five livres at Conflans, and four livres and a half at Paris.[2] In 1650 certain duties were sixteen deniers the pound in Normandy, twenty in Burgundy, and twenty-three in Champagne. Colbert declared that the merchants were ruined by the tolls.[3]

Manufactures, however, had not been entirely checked by such obstacles, in a country whose natural richness and fertility to some extent triumphed over the bad government from which it suffered. The value of the fabrics exported from France to England and Holland was estimated in 1656 at 80,000,000 livres a year.[4] Linen and serge stuffs were made at Rheims and Chalons; silk and woollen stockings in Beauce and Picardy; silk goods came from Lyons and Tours, and beaver hats from Paris and Rouen.[5] In 1656 the first establishment for making woven stockings was started in France, and was successful. It was stated, however, that from 1620 to 1663 the manufacturing interests of France had considerably declined, and that the English and Dutch had gained much of the trade that formerly belonged to the French. The manufacturers of silks at Lyons and Troyes had been most fortunate in retaining their business, but even these had lost.[6] There had been no change in tariffs which had modified the relation of French to foreign goods during this time. But manufacturing interests had suffered, with all others, from the evils of war and internal disturbances, and from the effects of excessive taxation and commercial restraints. When Joly was in Holland in 1647 he was impressed by the absence of beggars and of disorderly

[1] "Mém. sur les Finances" presenté à Louis XIV.

[2] Edict of January 12, 1633.

[3] Lettres de Colbert, ii., 48.

[4] Mém. de Jean de Witt, vi., 182.

[5] Addresse des six Corps des Marchands, 1654.

[6] Let. et Instructions de Colbert, ii., 125.

soldiers. "The troops," he said, "were paid, and one could go in safety by day and night."[1] In this order and tranquillity, which he noticed because it contrasted with the condition of France at this time, the Dutch merchants and manufacturers had prospered and increased their trade. In England, the Revolution, which produced so much greater political changes than the Fronde, had not so much disturbed the prosperity and business of the country. In fishing, also, the Dutch were far in advance, and claimed to have engaged in this industry thirty times as many vessels as the French.

The weakness of the navy was a serious injury to French commerce. The trade of the cities of southern France on the Mediterranean was greatly injured, and in some places destroyed, by the ravages of pirates. Two million, even six million livres of property belonging to the French was said to be destroyed yearly by the corsairs, who came from Algiers, Tunis, and Dunkirk, and whose ships were often manned by desperadoes from every part of Europe.[2] The French government was unable to extirpate these pests, and they frequently ravaged the coasts. Houses and towns along the Mediterranean shore were fortified and armed so as to be ready for some sudden invasion. Cannon commanded the bays. A flag hoisted on a high tower by day, and fires by night, warned the inhabitants of the approach of the corsairs. In one town eighty persons were captured within four months and taken off to be sold as slaves.[3] The corsair ships were well armed and equipped. One that was captured had seventeen cannon and a crew of one hundred and fifty Turks. Forty Christian slaves of different nations worked at the oars.[4] The reprisals that were allowed are contrary to our ideas. The French captains were ordered to make descents on

[1] Voyage à Münster en 1647, 119, 120.

[2] *Gazette*. Assemblée des Notables, 1626, 207. Recueil des États Generaux, xvi., 43; xvii., 193.

[3] Much curious information on this subject is found in the official report of the voyage of inspection of M. de Seguiran in 1633.

[4] *Gazette*, 1631, 470.

Barbary and take such prisoners as they could, that they might work as slaves in the French galleys.[1]

It was claimed that the commerce of Marseilles in 1633 was not over half of what it had been, and this diminution was charged, in large degree, to the effects of the war and the ravages of pirates. But many vexatious restraints on trade, both in France and other countries, had also interfered with its development.[2] Toulon did not have over one hundred vessels, and the most of those were only fishing smacks. The capital then invested in shipping was only about 150,000 livres.[3]

Many of the numerous trading companies that were organized under Richelieu never proceeded further than their prospectus. Still there was some development of French interests in the colonies. Though the various settlements attempted in Canada produced but small results, beginnings were made of French colonization in the Antilles and at various places along the coast of Africa.[4] A treaty of commerce was made with Russia, but that empire was still thrown open very cautiously to strangers.[5] Various expeditions were made against Algiers to repress piracy and compel that country to make peace and observe it, but the relations of France with Algeria were confined to redeeming captives and hanging pirates.

The interest in colonial development which was aroused at this time was increased under Colbert, and France established many prosperous colonies which might have been the foundation of a foreign empire like that of England.

Improvements in the condition of any country consist

[1] Lettres de Colbert, iii., 28, *et passim*. It was, however, claimed that the spiritual welfare of the heathen would be advanced by their slavery in Christian countries. [2] Relation de Seguiran, 230, 231. [3] *Ib.*, 274, 275.

[4] The measures adopted for the colonization of Canada seem to have been sometimes more vigorous than judicious. Grotius, in 1643, "Epistolæ Ineditæ," 113, speaks of the intention of the government to send to Canada all women of bad character for the increase of its population. The young Hollanders at Paris, in 1657, speak of a similar endeavor, made at that time. —"Journal d' un Voyage à Paris en 1657," 214.

[5] See Mercure François, t. xvi., 1022, *et seq.*

largely in improving the means of communication. Modern, like Roman civilization is a civilization of roads. The great increase in the prosperity of France under Henry IV., can be measured by the sums which were expended on rivers, canals, and highways. Six hundred thousand livres were spent on them in 1599, and in 1608 three millions and a half of livres were appropriated for these purposes. Such works were abandoned after Henry's death. The insignificant sum of 37,000 livres was expended on them in 1616, 38,634 in 1639, and but 100,000 in 1661.[1]

The highways were left to the care of local authorities, and what little was done was usually the construction of a road leading more conveniently to the residence of some great nobleman. They were not laid out of a uniform width, and frequent encroachments on them were made by adjacent owners. They were ill repaired, and were ordinarily sinuous, full of holes, stones, and other obstructions. The overflows of the rivers, which were much more frequent and serious than now, often made impassable the highways which before had been only dangerous.[2]

The chief evil under which France suffered was, however, the system of taxation, and its abuses were aggravated at a time when the needs of war compelled a great increase in the amounts to be raised. This period, and especially the years of the Fronde, found the condition of the mass of the French people one of special misery, and their suffering was due in almost equal degree to the ravages of the soldier and of the tax-gatherer. In ascertaining the amount that was taken from the people, and also the amount of wages which they earned at this time, it is necessary to state the relative value of the money of that period and our own. The actual value of money was subject to considerable fluctuation from the variations in the price of silver. Then, as now, France used the double standard. But the relative value of gold to silver was one to 11.85 in 1615, and one to 14.76 in 1640.

[1] Conferences sur l'Histoire etc., des Ponts et Chaussées: Ancre.

[2] See various "Pièces Justificatives" on the condition of the roads, printed in "Études sur l'Administration des Voies publiques," Vignon, t. i.

The government endeavored to hold its silver at its former value, and the merchants insisted on taking it at its present value. In 1640 the change was, however, recognized by the creation of a new coin, the louis d'or, which was used until the Revolution, and was made of the value of ten livres of silver.[1] The value of the louis d'or is about twenty francs of the present money of France, and the livre, from 1640 to 1660, represents in money value two francs.

The difference is still more considerable when we consider the relative value. So many elements affect prices that such an estimate must be a rough one, but, comparing the beginning of the reign of Louis XIV. with the present time, I think it is not excessive to say, that a given amount of money then had a relative value as large as three times as great a sum would have now.[2] In giving, therefore, figures in livres, the term of account then used, one livre is equal in weight to two francs, and in relative value would represent about six francs, nearly one dollar and twenty cents of American money, or five shillings of English money.[3]

The increase in amounts collected by taxes, from the death of Henry IV. to the death of Mazarin, was much more than the depreciation in the value of money, which did not exceed thirty per cent., or than the increase in wealth, with was very small, if any. The chief item in the French budget was the taille. This was a direct tax imposed upon the property of those assessed, and in theory it was in proportion to the amount they possessed. But in the most of France it fell chiefly upon personal property. It was impossible that with the most exact and honest system it should be accurately apportioned, and

[1] Ord., March 31, 1640.

[2] A vast number of figures supporting this estimate can be found in D'Avenel, t. ii., 158–178. It is not based solely on the price of wheat, as is sometimes done, and this alone does not, I think, furnish a sufficient criterion.

[3] These figures are all, of course, approximate, and expressed in round numbers, for convenience.

the system that was in force was both loose and dishonest. The local assessors exempted some and overtaxed others; they released their friends or their villages, and imposed an increased burden upon others, and, to a very large extent, exemptions or reductions were obtained by those who had money with which to bribe or to litigate.[1] The bulk of this tax fell upon the peasants.

From it, indeed, a large part of the population, and the part possessing the most of the wealth of the country, was entirely exempt. The nobility were free from any personal tax, and under this head were probably included 400,000 people. The clergy were free, almost all of the officials of every kind, and the members of many professions and trades. Many of the cities had obtained exemption from the taille by the payment of a sum of money, which was either nominal or very moderate. Only laborers and peasants, it was said, still remained subject to it.[2] Out of 11,000,000 people in those portions of France where the taille was a personal tax, probably 2,500,000 were exempt.[3]

The amount collected by this duty increased during the war with ruinous rapidity. The taille in 1618 amounted to 20,000,000 livres; in 1630 to 38,000,000, and in 1657 it reached 53,400,000.[4] Such amounts could not be entirely collected. The arrears of old taxes increased, and in many cases the peasant had nothing left with which to pay. Arrears down to 1646 were discharged in 1648, at the request of the Parliament, and 20,000,000 of arrears were discharged for the later years of Mazarin's administration.[5]

To the amount of the taille must be added the sums

---

[1] Lettres Patentes, Sept. 30, 1638. Edict, Nov., 1641. Testament Politique de Richelieu. Cahiers États de Normandie, *passim*, etc. Lettres, etc., de Colbert, i., 360, *et passim*, referring to such abuses in Guienne. The authorities for the various abuses in taxation are innumerable.

[2] See Vauban "Dîme Royale." État de la France en 1648. Forbonnais. "Recherches sur les Finances." D'Avenel: "La Monarchie Absolue."

[3] Lettres et Instructions de Colbert, ii., 19, 66.

[4] Mallet: Comptes Rendus.

[5] Lettres de Colbert, ii., 8.

collected, in the same manner, for the support and rations of the troops, which often increased this tax by more than one half.[1] In 1643, it is safe to estimate that there was collected for these taxes in the portions of France where there were not local States, 60,000,000 livres, and that this fell upon 8,500,000 people. Over 7 livres, as much as 42 francs now or about eight dollars, was paid by the poorer classes *per capita* in one year for direct taxes. Such a rate of taxation was unbearable, and there is abundant proof of the ruin it produced in many parts of France.

Towns became burdened with arrears; the inhabitants were held liable as a body until they deserted their homes, and a former village became a wilderness. The taxes were collected with wastefulness and brutality from those who had no ready money with which to pay. A company of fifty men were sent to Orbec by the tax-receiver. They broke the doors of the houses, cut the wheat and sold it at ruinous prices, and burned the carts.[2] In Picardy and Champagne parishes were deserted, and labor had ceased in many parts of the kingdom.[3]

At Cirey, in 1651, the rolls for the taille, required from the local officials, could not be furnished, because there was no one in the village who knew how to read or write, but a staff was found on which various marks made by a knife represented the sums imposed on the inhabitants, and the amounts they had paid. A few half-ruined houses now composed the village, and unless they were released from their taxes the inhabitants said they must leave it. There were already 200 livres of arrearages and payment was impossible.[4]

In 1643 the Court of Aids in Normandy declared that

[1] Cahiers de Bresse, 1649. Mss. Godefroy, cclxxx., 60. Arrêts du Conseil, Aug. 3, 1660; Jan. 5, 1662. [2] Cahier des États de Normandie, iii., 110.

[3] Arrêts de Conseil, May 11, 1641.

[4] Procès Verbal of 1651, published by Feillet. In his valuable work, "La Misère au Temps de la Fronde," M. Feillet has collected and published a great number of contemporary official statements of the condition of various towns and provinces.

the prisons were full of men who had paid their own taille, but were confined because they were unable to pay that of their insolvent neighbors. More than fifty men imprisoned for such a cause had died at Pontandemer alone, and the province demanded succor in the wretched state to which it had been reduced by the rigor of the farmers of taxes.[1]

This system of collecting the taille did not extend over the whole of France. Languedoc, Provence, Burgundy, Brittany, Béarn, and some smaller divisions, were countries of the States, portions of the kingdom which had preserved their local assemblies. By these States the direct tax which the province paid to the general government was voted and imposed. The endeavor of the French kings was to do away with these remains of parliamentary government. The last session of the States of Normandy was held in 1657.[2] For many years before that, their authority had been practically destroyed, and their sessions only served for the description of the ravages from war, and the oppression from taxation, to which that unfortunate province was subjected. Dauphiny and Guienne in like manner had lost their right to local government.

But in some provinces, these institutions were still in full vigor in the middle of the seventeenth century, and their existence caused a great difference between the prosperity of those favored districts, and that of the rest of France. The local States not only attended to various local expenses, but they fixed the amount of the gift or contribution which the province would make to the general expenses of the country, and they attended to its collection. What this sum should be was a matter of constant controversy between the officers of the king, and the representatives of the province. Personal influences, bribes, and threats were used to produce liberality among the delegates, and the government often endeavored to

[1] Articles de Remonstrances, etc., Nov. 26, 1643. Reg. Secr., Aug. 8, 1644.

[2] See Lettres de Colbert, t. 2, Cahiers des États, 411.

obtain the election of those who would act in its interests. But these bodies still retained such a degree of independence, that the amount collected by the taille from the countries of the States was, *per capita*, less than one third of the sum paid in the rest of France. The provinces of the States contained nearly one third of the population of France. They paid one tenth of the taille. In 1639, Normandy and Brittany had nearly the same population. Normandy paid 7,000,000 for the taille and Brittany 1,500,000.[1]

Not only did the inhabitants of these provinces pay much less in proportion, but the taille was there collected as it should have been in all of France. It was a real and not a personal tax. It fell upon the land, and was therefore imposed with ease and comparative accuracy. Lands that were called noble were exempt from taxation, but it was an exemption that belonged to the land. The exemptions from the taille, though unjust, were not so numerous nor so glaring as in the rest of France. The tax was collected under the direction of the States at a comparatively moderate expense, and the peasant who owned no land was free from the pursuit of the tax gatherer.

The south was largely a country of States, and it possessed also exemption from most import duties. These provinces had not entirely lost their independence in their gradual union with France. They refused to pay the duty on merchandise. The government decided to collect the duties at the border of the northern provinces, until the inhabitants of the others should suffer the establishment of these taxes, and the matter remained in that condition for four hundred years. Brittany also was outside of the customs duties. The local States often showed a narrow spirit, and made unreasonable objections to measures that were liberal and beneficial. Their members caused occasional scandal by the liberality of the allowances for their own expenses. But the condition of the

[1] Normandy was probably a wealthier province, but no such difference existed in wealth as was found in the amount of taxes.

residents of these provinces, except as they were sometimes exposed to devastations by the armies, was far superior to that of the rest of France. The difference was chiefly found in the country and the small towns, but the commercial advantages which the provinces enjoyed increased the trade and the wealth of their cities. The risings of peasants, caused by taxation and misery, were generally in the other portions of France. The influence of these local States was not affected by the efforts of Richelieu, and they were not attacked by Mazarin. The countries of the States were unable, however, to preserve their independence undiminished, during the reign of Louis XIV. In 1689 Mme. de Sévigné described the States of Brittany, the province which least of all became French in its character, and which jealously endeavored to preserve its local independence. There was a crowd, a press, a great confusion. The governor of the province indulged in a profuse and reckless magnificence. His table was constantly set for sixty. The representative of the king demanded 3,000,000 livres, and it was voted without debate. "One has only to demand what the king wants," she writes again. "No one says a word. Presents, pensions, gambling, balls every night, comedies three times a week,—there you can see what are the States." [1]

Next to the taille, the most important tax was the gabelle, and, though less onerous, it also produced a vast amount of misery. The gabelle was a duty on salt, and it was farmed by the government. The burden of an excessive tax was increased by the cupidity of those who bought the right to collect its proceeds. The French government retained a monopoly of salt, much like that

[1] Lettres de Mme. de Sévigné, t. vi., let. 1119, and letter of Oct. 26, 1689. A similar condition in Languedoc is described in a letter of the Bishop of Mirepoix to Colbert in 1672. Cor. Ad. sous Louis XIV., t. i., 288.

The best authority for the condition of the local States is in the letters and despatches contained in "Correspondance Administrative sous Louis XIV.," t. i. They fill a volume of 1000 pages. See also D' Avenel, t. ii., p. 205–220. Lettres et Instructions de Colbert, t. iv., 1–179.

which it now possesses of tobacco, but the price which it charged for this article of necessity was such, that the States of Normandy declared that salt cost the people more than all the rest of their food.[1] In some provinces the price fixed imposed a duty of about 3,000 per cent., and salt sold for nearly ten sous a pound, thirty times its present price in France, though it is still subject to a considerable duty.[2]

From this tax there were no personal exemptions, but large portions of the country were not subject to the gabelle. Brittany was free. Guienne, Poitou, and several other provinces were wholly exempt or paid a trifling subsidy. About one third of the population were free from this duty, and the exemption was so valued that a rumor that the gabelle was to be imposed was sufficient to excite a local insurrection.[3] Such a duty, on an article like salt, was also necessarily much more oppressive for the poor than the rich. As the exorbitant price would compel many to go without the commodity, the tax was often rendered a direct one. The amount of salt was fixed which a family should consume, and this they were forced to take at the price established by the government.[4] Houses were searched in the investigation of the amounts that had been taken, and still more in the pursuit after illegal salt, and the persons of the peasants were often examined without regard to age or sex.[5]

The gabelle was farmed for about 20,000,000 livres, and to cover the expenses and profits of the farmers probably 27,000,000 in all was collected from the people. A family of six would, on an average, pay the equivalent of ninety francs, or about eighteen dollars a year, for this duty. The

[1] Cahiers des États de Normandie, i., 150.

[2] Edicts of 1636 and 1638. D'Avenel, ii., 281. This, of course, is allowing for the difference in relative values of money. See Relazioni Venete, Francia, ii., 343.

[3] Letter of Richelieu to Archbishop of Bordeaux, Aug., 1631.

[4] Lettres de Mazarin, i., 286. There are a great number of edicts regulating and confusing the imposition of the gabelle.

[5] Cahiers des États de Normandie, i., 184.

peasant of Normandy or Champagne, during the Fronde, who gave for a pound of salt a day and a half of labor, would see with envy and amazement his descendant eating salt that costs ten centimes.

When the cost of this article was so high, it was unavoidable that there should be large amounts sold illegally, and that every endeavor should be made to avoid buying it of the government. The punishment of death did not prevent the sale of salt by contraband dealers, and the apprehension of such smuggling furnished an excuse for new abuses. The officers of the tax farmers not only made frequent searches, but they often seized government salt under the pretext that it was contraband, and against such oppression an ignorant peasant without money had neither defence nor redress. The gabelle caused local insurrections among the peasants almost as much as the taille.[1]

In the disorders which were excited or encouraged by the Fronde, contraband salt was often made openly. Gangs of disarmed soldiers or marauders sold it, and were welcome among those oppressed by this duty. Even the soldiers in the service, in default of pay, often resorted to this source of profit. An officer relates that as his troops were poorly paid, they sold contraband salt openly at Saint Valery, and the officers of the gabelle protested in vain. Their commander approved of their conduct, as they thus obtained subsistence without costing any thing to the king, and without oppressing his subjects.[2] An edict declared in 1646, that gentlemen, soldiers of all conditions, and the most of the inhabitants of the frontiers, many of them openly and with arms in hand, sold contraband salt, forced the warehouses of the gabelle and diminished the revenues by half.[3] Even using sea-water for cooking was an offence demanding severe punishment. It is not strange, that official documents show that complaints of

[1] Lettres de Richelieu, v., 485, *et passim*. Lettres de Mazarin, *passim*.

[2] Mém. de Pontis, 601, 602.

[3] Ordinance, Oct. 15, 1646. *Ib.*, July 6, 1649.

frauds on the gabelle caused each year almost four thousand seizures in private houses, and the arrest of four thousand men and women, and that over two thousand people were usually serving in prison for offences against these laws.[1]

The other indirect duties, though imposed on a great number of objects, did not altogether yield as much as the gabelle.[2] They also were farmed, and very largely at an inadequate price. One financier held a farm at a certain sum for twenty-four years. At last the government demanded an increase of 600,000 livres in the yearly rent, and he paid it rather than abandon his contract.[3] Mazarin wrote to Turenne that while the Duke of Bouillon claimed that he had received 100,000 livres a year of revenue from Sedan, and though the royal commissioners had estimated the revenue at 75,000, the government did not actually receive over 40,000. But the sums which the king received, he admitted, were no criterion by which to judge what could be collected by an individual for his own benefit.[4]

A very important question in every government is the cost of collecting the revenues, the difference between the sum which the people pay, and that which the treasury receives. What has been said about the financial measures of this time shows, that this must have amounted to a percentage which would now be regarded as monstrous. It is impossible to do more than give a very rough guess at what this percentage was. Enormous profits were made by those who farmed the taxes, but there is no record of the amount, except the size of the fortunes which were accumulated. The fees and profits of the great body of officials, who assisted in the collection

[1] Figures given in "La Misère au Temps de la Fronde," 68. I think the true number probably exceeded the figures that are here given.

[2] They were so numerous that Guy Patin complained they would presently impose the tax established by Vespasian, which in Paris would produce a large revenue. Lettres de Patin, i., 43.

[3] Tallemant des Réaux, ii., 36. Rocher Portail.

[4] Lettres de Mazarin, iii., 104.

of the taille and the duties which the government did not farm, mounted to a very large sum, but no accurate record was kept of them. They seem to show an entire expense of about 10,000,000 livres, in collecting 40,000,000.[1] The farmers of taxes probably collected them more cheaply, but this gain was more than offset by their own profits. Apart from the additional loss caused by seizures, and sales of property, and by outrages committed by the tax officers, it is safe to estimate, that under Richelieu and Mazarin, the tax-payers paid 25 per cent. more than the government received, and this is a much smaller percentage than is given by many contemporary writers.[2]

The amount raised by these various methods was not sufficient to defray the expenses of the government during this period. The total cost of carrying on the war was from 50,000,000 to 80,000,000 a year, and very large sums were paid for interest. Some items of expense were indeed very small. The budget prepared for 1629 shows but 75,000 livres for the posts, 39,000 for public institutions, and 80,000 for charities.[3] But in 1626, Richelieu estimated that the expenses of the government exceeded its receipts by 10,000,000, and that it owed 52,000,000.[4] In 1648, Colbert stated the debt at 170,000,000.[5] It was still larger at the close of the maladministration of Fouquet. These figures do not, however, represent the actual amount by which the government was increasing its charges. Large sums were raised every year by the creation and sale of new offices, but an office was bought, because it conferred the right to a salary, or to the collection of fees or emoluments of some sort. Such creations, therefore, increased the permanent charges upon the people as much as the issue of new rentes.

[1] Mss. Arsenal, 4487.

[2] Rapine: Relation, 201. Archives Nationales, K. K., 1072, etc. Vauban in 1700, estimated the expense of collection at 25 per cent. (Disme Royale 29), and it was probably larger at this period.

[3] Comptes de Mallet, Arsenal, 4487. D'Avenel, ii., 447.

[4] Lettres de Richelieu, ii., 318.

[5] Lettres, etc. de Colbert, ii., 17, *et seq.*

Under Richelieu and Mazarin, the sums received for the sale of new offices must have exceeded 10,000,000 a year, though the opposition of the Parliament produced a beneficial effect in diminishing this pernicious source of revenue. The edicts under Richelieu show the greatest ingenuity in the creation of new and imaginary offices.[1] Examiners of paper, inspectors of hogs, superintendents of hay, honorary counsellors, gentlemen of the chamber, masters of the chase, every variety of office was devised, and there were many officials of every class.[2] It was estimated that there were under Louis XIII. 40,000 hereditary offices.[3] Many positions were held by three incumbents. Each performed the duties during one of three years, but all received salaries. Richelieu says that these offices were sold at a rate which practically cost the government twelve per cent. on the money it received.[4]

Apart from temporary loans and the creation of offices, large amounts of rentes were issued. The rentes of the Hotel de Ville had been created in 1522 and constituted a permanent national debt, secured on various taxes, and redeemable at the pleasure of the government. In 1620 the interest charge was less than 3,000,000. In 1639 it amounted to over 20,000,000, and at the end of Fouquet's administration it was said to be 52,000,000. The payments were made at the Hotel de Ville from a list that was furnished of the holders, and as there was no system for identifying the persons, the owner of rentes would sometimes find that another had answered to his name when called, and had received the interest due.[5] But a more serious trouble was the failure of the government to pay any one.

The expenses caused by the indefinite creation of offices are shown by the fact, that on the payment of 16,000,000

[1] D'Avenel, ii., 307, states the sum received under Richelieu, for the sale of offices, at 500,000,000, but I think the figures are too high.

[2] The long list of these new creations can be found in the edicts.

[3] Anciennes Lois Françaises, 1662.

[4] Testament Politique, ii., 167.

[5] Mss. 4487, Arsenal.

livres of rentes in 1648, the fees of the officers charged with the duty absorbed 1,600,000.[1] Not over three quarters of the amounts due for the rentes were paid during the later years of Richelieu's administration, and during the troubles of the Fronde the rentiers had difficulty in obtaining half the sum that was due them.[2]

Various edicts issued after Fouquet's overthrow cancelled many rentes as fraudulent, authorized the redemption of others at the price for which they had been issued, and reduced the interest from nearly six per cent. to five per cent. On one issue of 1,000,000 of rentes under Fouquet, the government had received but 100,000. The holders protested in vain against measures which claimed for their justification, the welfare of the state and the frauds attending the issue of many of these obligations.[3]

We have considered the nature of the government at the middle of the 17th century, the system of taxes by which its expenses were paid, and the financial straits to which it was driven by war and insurrection. The facts that have appeared have not indicated general prosperity. The condition of the mass of the people in France under the old régime was, at best, one of little comfort, and at worst, one of great misery. The period of the Fronde, and the years that immediately preceded and followed it, were full of suffering and distress for large portions of the French people. An examination of the wages that were earned, the taxes that had to be paid, and the amount of the necessaries of life that could be purchased with the residue, will show how poor was the lot of the peasant and the common laborer, even when he was safe from violence and pillage. Innumerable contemporary records can be produced, to show how greatly these evils were aggravated by the effects of war and internal disturbances. Some of these causes of misery were only temporary, but many of them were permanent, and their result

[1] Reg. Hotel de Ville, ii., 436. [2] Reg. Hotel de Ville, ii., 425–451.

[3] Journal de la Chambre de Justice, t. ii. Anc. Lois françaises, xviii., 69–71. Lettres de Colbert, ii., *passim*. Journal d'Ormesson, ii., 149–156.

was at last to be the French Revolution. The condition of the people in a country specially favored by climate, position, and natural fertility, shows how unwise or corrupt government, the greed and the selfishness of the classes that have possession of power, injudicious laws, and injurious regulations, can retard prosperity and cause misery to multitudes. An industrious and frugal people, in a fertile and beautiful land, found poverty as its ordinary lot. To escape the severest forms of need and misery, was as much as could be expected by the mass of the population.

I do not intend to discuss, in this place, the customs or modes of life of the social classes who were raised above the necessity of manual labor. These would be, perhaps, of more interest, but the review of any period is very defective which does not indicate the condition of the poorer classes, which at this time constituted four fifths of the population. The material, from which to describe their condition fully, is difficult to find at a time when few statistics were kept, but a fairly accurate idea of it can be gained.

No census of the French population had as yet been taken, and the estimates that were made from time to time were necessarily exceedingly loose. People ordinarily overestimate the population of their own country or city. Between 1640 and 1650 it was calculated by some, that France contained 40,000,000, and even 60,000,000 inhabitants.[1] Paris was estimated to have 900,000 people by a very intelligent magistrate, who lived there all his life, and the *Gazette*, in 1636, said that it had 1,000,000.[2] Such figures are enormously exaggerated. The enumeration prepared by the superintendents towards 1700 showed the population of the provinces which composed France in 1640 at 16,300,000.[3] Alsace was added in 1648, and Roussillon and Artois were added by the Peace of the Pyrenees. While the condition of the country seems poor and

[1] Mss. Godefroy, cxxx., 260.

[2] Journal d'Olivier d'Ormesson, 610, in 1649. *Gazette*, 1636, 558.

[3] See table printed by d'Avenel, ii., 430, 431.

squalid when we compare it with France of to-day, it appeared prosperous to those who compared it with other countries at that time. When Mazarin crossed the Alps in 1630 he was impressed by the populousness of France.[1] Richelieu boasted in 1622 that France had so many men, that foreign cities compared with hers seemed like deserts.[2] In 1657, when the country had rallied somewhat from its depressed condition during the Fronde, it seemed not only beautiful, but populous, to travellers who lived in Holland. These travellers saw, however, only Paris and the country between that city and Calais.[3] Over forty years later, when the wars of Louis XIV. and the persecutions of the Huguenots were enfeebling the kingdom, Vauban estimated its population at 19,000,000, but others estimated it as low as 15,000,000.[4] I think that the average population of France during the administration of Mazarin was about 16,000,000 people.

It is equally difficult to ascertain accurately the population of Paris. Under Henry II., a century before this time, it seems to have been from 300,000 to 350,000. A rough enumeration under Richelieu made it somewhat over 400,000. In 1657 the Dutch embassador investigated the question, and concluded that Paris contained 30,000 houses and 600,000 people.[5] Vauban, in 1700, estimated, however, that the city had only 24,000 houses, but had a population of 720,000.[6] Judging from such data as we possess, Paris by 1655 had at least 500,000 inhabitants.

The majority of the French people at this time were engaged in agriculture. The development of manufactures and the changes produced by modern inventions have largely increased the percentage of the population which lives in cities. The wages of the ordinary French laborer of this period were not only subject to the usual fluctuations, but variations existed in the different por-

[1] See his letter of Feb. 14, 1630. Jeunesse de Mazarin, 196.
[2] Mém., i., 260.
[3] Journal d'un Voyage, 22, etc.
[4] Disme Royale, Int., 20.
[5] Journal d'un Voyage, 249.
[6] Disme Royale, 76.

tions of France much greater than could now be found. Where the peasant was born he usually lived and died, and to move from Normandy to Touraine or from Picardy to Poitou was an undertaking more difficult than it would now be to cross the Atlantic. The wages of a day laborer at farm work averaged from six to nine sous. A woman would not receive more than half as much.[1] In 1700 the wages of such laborers are stated at nine sous in harvest time, and not over eight sous at other seasons, and there had been a considerable appreciation of prices within fifty years.[2] Taking seven sous as an average, that would be fourteen cents, or in equivalent value forty-two cents a day. Those most employed would not usually work over 200 days a year, after deducting Sundays and feast days.[3] An income of seventy livres, one hundred and forty francs, twenty-eight dollars, or in relative value eighty dollars, would be above, rather than below, that of the most of the peasants. Richelieu said that he would pay a man to work on a canal on his grounds one hundred livres a year, and for that he could live well.[4] It was an amount undoubtedly larger than would be received by most laborers of that sort. It was upon this class that the taxes fell. "The taille falls only on the peasants and the miserable," one of Colbert's officers wrote him. "Those who have credit escape."[5] The average amount of the gabelle, the taille, and the support of troops, was nine livres in the provinces subject to the full weight of both taxes, and we must multiply this by four to reach the average amount paid even by a small family. The violence often attending the collection of these taxes has been referred to. "Those who collect the taille," the Lieutenant of Orleans wrote, "are such terrible animals that a great portion of them

[1] Figures given by Monteil from Mss. in his possession. Figures showing that these were average prices can be found stated incidentally in many papers and memoirs of the period.

[2] Disme Royale, 95–8.

[3] Forbonnais: "Recherches sur les Finances."

[4] Let. de Richelieu, iv., 304–306.

[5] Pellot. Supt. to Colbert, Cor. Administrative sous Louis XIV., iii., 1, 2.

ought to be exterminated."[1] Considering these conditions during the heavy taxation and distress of war, one half that a family earned must often have been consumed by taxes.

The wages of artisans were somewhat higher. They are stated to have averaged twelve sous in 1700, and probably averaged ten sous at this time. This would give an income that would be equivalent to $120 or over. Skilful cutters, weavers, locksmiths, and other superior artisans commanded considerably higher wages.[2] The artisans also suffered much less from the taille. Many cities contributed little or nothing to this tax, and some handicrafts were exempt from it.

Domestic servants were numerous from the great numbers employed by people of wealth. There were probably at least a million and a half serving in various capacities. Twenty livres a year was small pay for them, and they had food and lodging besides. They were little troubled by the tax gatherers, for the exemption of the head of an establishment usually protected his domestics. A valet receiving sixty livres a year, the equivalent of about seventy dollars, was regarded as largely paid.[3]

Though such wages seem low, the prices of all other things were, of course, much lower than now. They were not so low, however, that the earnings of the most of the population amounted to more than starvation wages. The average wages of a laborer were seven sous, or fourteen cents a day. The sum that was allowed for the food of a soldier per day was three sous three deniers, or about six and one half cents. For a sailor there was allowed four sous six deniers.[4] This, however, was some years later, and it was the amount paid the captain for furnishing rations to the sailors, on which doubtless he

[1] Courbeville to Colbert. *Id.*, 363. The evils and abuses of taxation can be found fully stated in the official correspondence of the time. We are not obliged to take them from the complaints of the taxed or the remonstrances of local States.

[2] Disme Royale, 92–4.

[3] Tallemant i., 249. Monteil. Disme Royale, 82. D'Avenel, t. ii., tables in appendix, 4.

[4] Lettres et Inst. de Colbert, iii., 728.

was expected to make a profit. But at that price, the cost of the rations of two people would absorb a laborer's entire wages.

The most important item of consumption is bread, and the price of wheat ordinarily attracts most attention. The fluctuations in its price during this period were rapid and great. Wheat in Paris, from 1615 to 1630, averaged $2\frac{1}{2}\frac{4}{3}$ livres or $5\frac{2}{2}\frac{2}{3}$ francs, or nearly one dollar per bushel. From 1630 to 1643 the average price was three livres or as much as one dollar and fifteen cents per bushel.[1] These prices continued about the same, except as they were affected by bad crops or military disturbances. In 1649 the best wheat sold at a dollar and twenty-five cents, and rye for eighty cents;[2] in 1658 it was selling at ninety cents in the country;[3] in 1660 for about one dollar and five cents at Paris.[4] But these prices at times rose with great rapidity. Wheat was selling in Paris at thirteen livres the setier in January, 1649, and eleven days later it was selling at thirty livres, and for a few days in March it sold at sixty livres or nearly five dollars a bushel. This, however, was when the king was endeavoring to cut off the supplies from the city, and does not, perhaps, furnish an accurate criterion. Peace was made in March, but the crop of 1649 was bad. The price again rose rapidly, and wheat was purchased for Paris at twenty-one livres the setier or three dollars and a quarter per bushel.[5] There was a bad crop in 1630, and the failure of the crop soon produced a famine. A very inferior article of wheat had been selling at seven livres the setier, and in fifteen days it sold at nineteen.[6]

[1] These prices are taken from the mercuriales of Paris or official reports of the sales at the regular Paris markets. Archives Nationales, K. K., 986–991. In reducing them to our measures, the setier, the measure then used, is calculated at 110 kilogrammes, and our pound at 453 grains. The livre of that time is estimated at two francs, its present money value, and the figures given are the actual money equivalents without any reference to the relative values of the same amount of money.

[2] Journal d'Ormesson, i., 631. [3] Lettres de Colbert, i., 309, *et seq.*

[4] Traité de la Police, ii., 1021.

[5] Registres de l'Hôtel de Ville, ii., 405–425.

[6] Assemblée au Chatelet, Dec. 12, 1630. Traité de la Police, ii., 1016.

The Parliament of Normandy forbade the removal of wheat from that province, and the Paris merchants in December were seeking for it in Picardy and Champagne, where it was said to be abundant. A still worse failure of the crops occurred in 1660 and 1661. In June, 1660, wheat was selling at thirteen livres ten sous the setier, or about five and a half francs, or one dollar and ten cents a bushel. In a few days it was selling at thirty-four livres the setier. The government, as usual, forbade any exportation, issued ordinances against the merchants who were claimed to be storing wheat and making an unconscionable profit, and bought large amounts for the use of the city. In September it had fallen to eighteen livres, but after the bad crop of 1661 it reached fifty livres the setier, or about four dollars and twenty cents a bushel. Bread sold at five cents a pound. In April, 1662, the government imported a large amount and sold it to the citizens at a little over eleven francs, or about two dollars and fifteen cents a bushel.[1]

The average prices that have been given are the prices at Paris, and for the best quality of wheat. Wheat usually sold higher there, than in many parts of the country where the cost of transportation was less. On the other hand, when there was any scarcity, wheat was transported to Paris rather than to some remote province, where the roads were almost impassable and the amount of the demand was uncertain. The artisan of Rheims or Poitiers who in one year paid less for his loaf than the shopkeeper of Paris, might in the next year have to pay more.

Fifty years later, Vauban gives seven livres the setier, or three francs a bushel, as the price for the wheat which the weaver would mix with rye to make his loaf. He could, however, only have meant the inferior wheat grown with rye, which always sold in the Paris market at about twenty per cent. below the price of good quality wheat. He estimates the rye, for the other half of the loaf, at over two

[1] Ordinances, etc., for that period contained in Traité de la Police, ii., 1021–1033.

francs the bushel.[1] A gradual increase in the price of grain is seen during this period. There was some depreciation in the value of money, and the large amount of land that was left desolate from the results of war and pillage must have had some effect. But it is apparent that the price of grain since then has appreciated much less than that of many articles. While it is, I think, an under-estimate to say that the money wages received for labor are three times as high now as they were then, the price of a bushel of wheat has appreciated, if we take the figures of the last few years, less than fifty per cent. There has been a greater increase than fifty per cent. in the price of the bread the laborer buys, but that is because the loaf is more palatable, more wholesome, and more nourishing, than that eaten by his ancestors under Richelieu and Mazarin.

Nor was the relatively higher price of wheat of advantage to the agriculturalist. The figures furnished by the French government show that the average production of wheat per acre has doubled since the time of Vauban. From 1635 to 1660, the total amount grown must have been less than could have been raised even by the appliances of that time, in a season of peace and tranquillity. The study of the leases of various properties during a long term of years leads to the conclusion, that while the sixteenth century in France was a period of increasing prosperity and agricultural progress, the seventeenth century, after 1610, showed only a stationary condition, if not indeed actual decadence.[2]

Rye usually sold for a little over half the price of wheat, and oats somewhat higher than rye. The average prices from 1630 to 1643 at Paris were about seventy cents for rye and eighty cents for oats. Barley sold for about half the price of wheat.[3] Enormous variations in price existed in different parts of the country, when there

[1] Disme Royale, 98. The price of wheat had, however, fallen somewhat when compared with the period from 1640 to 1660.

[2] Revue Archeologique de Sens., vi., 150,-191.

[3] Let. de Colbert in 1658.

had been a short crop in some sections. The abundance of one province was with difficulty and great expense sent to relieve the need of another. In 1693 wheat was selling for 24 livres the setier at Paris, and 11 livres at Nantes.[1] The price of wheat at Limoges usually varied twenty-five per cent. from that at Poitiers. The places are not one hundred miles distant.

Veal and mutton in 1640 sold at 5 sous or 10 cents a pound at Paris, and chicken was higher.[2] The average price was perhaps 7 or 8 cents. In the provinces veal and mutton were somewhat cheaper, but they were still beyond the reach of a laborer who earned 14 cents a day. The peasant could buy a work-horse for 25 livres or 50 francs. A horse for driving sold for four times that amount.[3] A donkey sold for 9 livres, and a pair of shoes could be bought for 12 sous or 25 cents.[4] Measuring these figures by the wages of labor, and taking the prices of average years, a bushel of wheat would cost seven days of the work of an ordinary laborer, a bushel of rye five days, a bushel of oats five and a half days, a bushel of barley over three days, a pound of mutton half a day, a pair of shoes almost two days, a horse for plowing would cost perhaps seventy-five days. It is evident, therefore, that the purchasing power of the average wages for a day of labor in France has greatly increased.

Wheat flour was a luxury far above the reach of peasants and laborers. It was indeed a luxury for all, and little bread that was eaten would now be regarded as white bread, or consumed by those accustomed to ordinary comfort. The bread that was eaten by laborers was made of barley and oats, from which the bran had not been removed.[5] A loaf of such bread sold at about 8 deniers or a cent and a quarter. Five sorts of bread were made at Paris; two called wheat bread, two moderately white, or

[1] Correspondance des controleurs généraux. This was in a time of famine.

[2] Arrêt du Parl't, March, 1640.

[3] In 1650, Mss. Godefroy, 132, Tarif du Conseil du Roi, 1641.

[4] Tables, App. 4, t. ii., D'Avenel. Tariffs for 1640 and 1641.

[5] Oisivetés: Vauban.

bourgeois bread, and one still poorer, called black bread, which was eaten by most. The bread eaten by a regularly employed weaver would be half wheat and half rye.[1] Bread prepared for the army was directed to be made of two portions of barley to one of wheat.[2]

The consumption of wheat was then much less than now. The amount of wheat produced in France has increased in a much larger ratio than its population. But at this time, wheat, except in years of famine, and except as affected by commercial regulations, was one of the largest exports.[3] France has now long been a large importer.

Meat was rarely eaten by peasants and laborers.[4] The houses in the country in which they lived were sometimes of wood, but more often of mud. Many had no chimneys. Any sort of lamps or candles were little used, and gave little light. The inhabitants were always dirty, usually ragged, and often hungry.

In 1625 France consumed 25,000,000 livres of sugar per year.[5] It sold for about 10 sous a pound or as much in relative value as 3 francs or 60 cents a pound now, and it was of course used by few. A pound of sugar, like a pound of salt, could only be earned by a day and a half of labor. The average consumption in that country was then a pound and a half per capita, and is now over seventeen pounds. Two million pounds of tobacco were consumed.[6] The ordinance which imposed a prohibitory tax of 30 sous a pound on all which did not come from certain French settlements, declared that the king's subjects by reason of its cheapness were using it at all hours, to the great prejudice of their health.[7] It was, however, used by few, and regarded as a vulgar habit. The consumption has increased since then 160 fold.[8] Notwith-

[1] Disme Royale, 98.

[2] Lettres de Colbert, i., 309.

[3] Vauban classes it with wine. Disme Royale, 27.

[4] In 1760 the consumption of meat in Lorraine was stated not to be over a pound per month to a person. Zulestein. "Mem. sur. la Lorraine," 1762.

[5] Let de Richelieu, ii., 165, 166. [6] *Ib.*

[7] Anciennes Lois Françaises, xvi., 347. [8] D'Avenel, ii., 267.

standing the endeavor then made to compel a large use of salt, the average amount consumed by the individual is now four times as much as then.[1] The price of wine was comparatively moderate, but the average consumption is now nearly one half more than it was then.[2]

That ignorance was almost universal among the lower classes is well known. In 1651, in the village of Cirey, there was no one who could read or write. In the parish of Montacher, there were only four of the inhabitants who knew enough to sign their names.[3] Little more education was found among those who were better circumstanced than the peasantry. Those employed in bringing chickens, eggs, and other provisions to Paris, presented their petition, in which they stated that the majority of the suppliants could not read or write, and they asked to be allowed to employ clerks who could sign receipts in their names.[4] Few valets or servants could read or write. Some men made a living by acting as writers for this class, and charged them from five to twenty sous for writing a letter for them, depending upon the elevation of style that was required.[5]

The sum which the government appropriated in 1639 for public instruction was only thirty-nine thousand livres. Education was in the hands of the colleges and the clergy, and the administration paid no attention to it. Richelieu said that the number of colleges was already too great. It encouraged the poorest to have their children study, so that few would be left for trade and war, which were the occupations that built up great states.[6]

Great forests still covered large portions of France, and the game that was carefully preserved for hunting, often

[1] *Ib.*, 289.

[2] Mss., 1428. Fleury Bib. Nat. Statistics of France for 1881.

[3] Memoir published in Bulletin archeologique de Sens. "Ont déclaré les dits habitants ne savoir signer, à l'exception de quatre."

[4] Ordinance, May 17, 1623.

[5] Journal d'un Voyage à Paris, 1657, 46, 47.

[6] Lettres de Richelieu, ii., 181. Similar objections against having too many schools are found in the Mercure for 1624, 426.

destroyed the crop of the peasant. The peasants could chase these animals from their fields with stones, but only upon the condition that they should not injure them.[1] As late as the States-General of 1789, numerous complaints are found in the cahiers, that beasts were preferred to men.

The condition of the people had been very prosperous under Henry IV. The natural reaction that follows a long period of disturbance was assisted by allowing a free export of grain, by judicious aid to manufacturers, and by large reductions in taxation. A contemporary declared that the recollection of 1609 was delightful to him; that the peasants then tilled their fields without disturbance from soldiers or tax-gatherers; they had comfortable furniture, sufficient food, and were in no danger of having their beds sold from under them; there was no complaint of excessive impositions, and no parish was pillaged by men at war. "Such" he says, "was the end of the reign of the good king, and the beginning of infinite evils."[2]

After his death, this improvement was checked, if not altogether lost. The peasant's lot was worse under Louis XIV. than under Henry IV. It has been claimed, and is probably true, that the increase in the small ownerships of land under Henry was lost during the Thirty Years' War and the Fronde.[3] It is certain that little of the land was then owned by the peasants.

The frequent overflows of the rivers produced great damage, and they seem to have been very numerous at this period. But thirty-two inundations were noticed from 1600 to 1610, and forty-eight from 1649 to 1659.[4] The Seine, the Rhone, the Loire, the Marne, the Garonne, and

[1] Article 137 of Ordinance of Orleans. [2] Mém. de Marolles, i., 19–24.

[3] This statement is made by Michelet, but he gives no statistics by which to prove it. M. Feillet adopts it on Michelet's authority. I think such must have been the result of the condition of affairs, but I have not been so fortunate as to find satisfactory statistics.

[4] Champion: "Histoire des Inondations en France," t. vi., tables. But the lack of records prevents these figures from being certain. There were many more in both periods.

most of the important rivers of France contributed more or less to such calamities. The lack of retaining walls or levees usually left the low streets of the cities in danger of being flooded by any considerable rise in the rivers. At the overflow of the Seine at Paris, in 1658, it was said that one could have rowed for some distance along the Rue Saint Honoré.[1] The country was even more exposed, and the freshets often carried away the roads and the crops together.[2]

Though the cities had suffered less than the open country, many of them were heavily in debt at the end of the wars with Germany and Spain; their industries, which had developed during some portions of the sixteenth century, and under Henry IV. were crippled and often destroyed. In addition to that most of them had incurred debts, not for their own uses, but to avoid some of the evils of war. Tours owed 500,000 livres, a sum which would be equivalent to a debt of over half a million dollars now. It had also conveyed to the government the octroi duties, from which its expenses would usually be defrayed, that it might be freed from the duty imposed for the sustenance of soldiers.[3] Many places had in like manner been forced to convey their octroi duties to the government, and though they were allowed to provide for their own needs by the simple process of doubling the octroi, such a remedy increased the price of food so greatly that it usually was not adopted.[4]

Amboise was a poor town, and subsisted only from such travel as went through it. But its advantage of position had been its ruin, for the troops had frequently passed through during the war. It owed 15,000 livres, borrowed to pay for the subsistence of some prisoners taken at Rocroi.[5] A more severe case was that of Beaune, a little city, whose population is not much over 10,000 now, and

[1] *Ib.*, t. i., 86.

[2] Rapport au Roi sur la Province de Touraine, 1664, 104–108.

[3] Rapport au Roi sur la Province de Touraine, 1664.

[4] Lettres de Colbert, iv., 27

[5] Rapport au Roi 133–5.

was undoubtedly less then. This place had incurred a debt of 560,000 livres during the war, its ordinary revenues having been taken by the government. These are not exceptional instances, but are illustrations of the condition of a great number of the French cities, both large and small.

In them was also found another evil that resulted from the multiplication of offices. The expenses and fees of the various local officers consumed what the towns raised for public purposes. Debts accumulated, the interest was unpaid, and bridges, streets, and roads were neglected and left to perish.[1] The town of Châtellerault had become involved in 200,000 livres of debt, and as it could not be collected, the mayor and assessor were several times imprisoned by the creditors in their endeavors to obtain payment.[2]

Though the peasants now suffered more from the taxation imposed by the general government than from feudal dues, many petty feudal rights still existed, some of which were vexatious, and some of which were oppressive. The seigneur in many places still retained an authority which was often abused. In the descriptions of prominent noblemen, which were furnished the government by the superintendents, the entry is frequent—"He beats the peasants."[3] Such seems to have been one of the ordinary manifestations of a violent temper. Even those who had reached the position of prosperous farmers were not safe from outrage. A farmer of Poitou was worth 6,000 crowns, and some gentleman resolved to marry his youngest son to the farmer's daughter. He accordingly rode over to the farm, accompanied by 200 followers, to seize the girl and have the marriage performed forthwith. But she and her father had left, and in his rage at this the gentleman and his party pillaged the house, and carried off the farmer's wife.[4]

---

[1] Rapport sur la Touraine, 138, 139. The condition of Touraine at this time should have been no worse than that of the most of France, and it probably was no worse.

[2] Histoire de Châtellerault, Salanne.

[3] See Rapports sur Poitou, and sur Touraine, *passim.*

[4] Rapport au Roi sur Poitou, 145.

For such acts of violence committed on inferiors there was no redress. A day laborer had no money to prosecute the gentleman who broke his whip over his head, and if he had, it would have done him no good. The influence of a nobleman with the courts and officers of justice would be sufficient to defeat a prosecution, started by some man who possessed neither wealth nor pedigree. It was felt that the right to beat one's peasantry, occasionally, ran with the land, and if a gentleman with hasty temper sometimes exercised it with too much violence, it could not be regarded as a serious offence. The peasants, wrote Ferron de Colbert, in 1658, wished to see the authority of the king fully established, that it might relieve them from the grievous tyranny of the seigneurs.[1]

To small pay, heavy taxation, poor crops, flood, famine, and all that ground down the poor, were added the devastations of war. One might content himself with saying that disorder and misery were found through large portions of France, but a general statement such as that conveys little idea of the wretchedness that existed. It is easy also to exaggerate in summing up the condition of the people, and the facts can only appear satisfactorily by collecting a variety of contemporary accounts, made in different years, and in different parts of the country.[2]

The little city of Laon, occupying a commanding position, and with an ancient and interesting cathedral, is about ninety miles northeast of Paris. Near it is the small and unimportant place of Marle, and around are the various towns that compose the diocese. They were unfortunately situated, lying between Paris and the Low Countries, not far from Rocroi, Lens, and many great

[1] *Ib.*, 135. The above statements are founded on the reports made to the king of the conditions of various provinces. Allowing for the natural tendency of those submitting reports to Colbert, I think their complaints of violence, perpetrated by some gentlemen upon their peasantry, are well founded.

[2] Many of the records to which I shall refer have been collected and printed by the research of M. Feillet in "La Misère au Temps de la Fronde."

battle-fields. A notary of Marle registered with the dryness of a legal document, from 1636 to 1665, the vicissitudes of his town in the foreign and domestic wars. He furnishes an accurate history of the lot of the inhabitants of this place during that period. At the invasion of Corbie, in 1636, the Spanish captured the chateau of Marfontaine near by, and took a large amount of booty, grain, horses, and other animals. Fifteen men and women were killed by them, and the enemy marched within six miles of Marle. At this, the women and girls fled from the town and remained away for three months. The expense of this, we are told by the notary, who usually reduced the misfortunes of his town to a money basis, was estimated at twenty thousand livres. The village and abbey of Clairefontaine near by were burned and destroyed.[1] In August the pest raged at Marle and continued until December. Four hundred people died, and the expense was eight thousand livres.[2] In November a garrison was placed in the town and remained until June, 1637. The inhabitants were obliged to furnish them with subsistence, and this amounted altogether, the careful notary tells us, to 39,815 livres and 10 sous.[3]

In June, 1637, the royal army remained near there for four days. The oats were ruined and a part of the wheat. On the 15th of June the pest began again and raged until the end of November. Six hundred people died. In December three hundred and fifty men were again stationed there as a garrison. The town paid the men six sous a day and furnished them with bread, but, notwithstanding that, during their stay until March, 1638, they caused unparalleled disorders.[4]

During the most of 1638 a regiment of six hundred cavalry, under Colonel Gassion, was in the town. These brought with them two hundred servants and sixty women, and lived at free quarters. Twenty houses were burned at an expense of fifteen thousand livres. In this

[1] Journal concernant les Désordres qui se sont passés dans la Comté de Marle pendant la Guerre, 2, 3. [2] *Ib.*, 4. [3] *Ib.*, 6. [4] *Ib.*, 6, 7.

year the town paid eight thousand livres to the government for taille and subsistence, while its local expenses were only two thousand.[1] Two different regiments were quartered on the town in 1639, and twice the army was encamped near it, in all for seven weeks. They destroyed most of the crops, and the expense to the town of furnishing supplies for the troops was estimated at twenty-nine thousand livres. The three following years are filled with similar entries.[2] In 1643 the battle of Rocroi was won, but Marle was obliged to take charge of some of the sick, and also of four hundred Spanish prisoners, and all these things were at the expense of the town. It cost them 7,300 livres, and in July the Count of Grancey camped near it for four days, and this ruined the wheat. In September the notary minutes that Innocent X. had been elected Pope and had taken for his arms a dove with an olive branch. "God grant," he says, "that this may be a sign of the peace that shall be given us." [3]

The next four years contain similar entries. There was not a year during which some part of the crops in the vicinity were not destroyed; not a year in which Marle was not obliged to furnish subsistence to soldiers; not a year in which some companies were not living there at free quarters for a longer or shorter time. But the miseries from 1636 to 1648 were to be far exceeded during the years of the Fronde.[4]

The depositions taken at Laon tell a similar story. In 1636 the Spanish armies, and in each year from 1636 to 1647 successive French armies, commanded by Le Meilleraie, Orleans, Enghien, Gassion, and others, marched and countermarched over the country. Many villages and churches were burned, and the ordinary course of justice was entirely interrupted during those years. Most of the inhabitants had been reduced to poverty, and crimes were committed with impunity by them, as well as by the soldiers. There was no attempt made to bring criminals to justice.[5]

[1] *Ib.*, 7–9. [2] *Ib.*, 10–16. [3] *Ib.*, 19. [4] *Ib.*, 19–29.

[5] Relations, etc., printed by Fleury. "Le Diocèse de Laon pendant la Fronde," 22–5.

In 1647 a witness declares that the soldiers lived with such license, that many laborers were obliged to abandon their houses and farms and to take refuge in the woods. In Barenton Buguy, where there had been two hundred families, there were now but seven or eight.[1]

In the year 1648 the battle of Lens was won, but this victory brought no relief. Some of Enghien's troops camped near Marle for fourteen days, and lived at discretion on the country. What they ate cost 30,000 livres, and what they destroyed was very much more. In September three regiments of cavalry entered Marle and remained there twenty-three days, pillaging the fields and destroying some houses. In October five regiments entered the town, consisting of the mercenaries of Erlach. The ravages were more severe than usual. Thirty houses were burned, and the entire damage they did was estimated at 100,000 livres.[2] The counsellor at Laon testified, that women and girls were violated and turned naked into the streets.[3]

The ravages of 1649 were still worse, and this year there was a failure of the crop, even where it escaped destruction from war. It was almost impossible to labor, and a portion of the people died from hunger by reason of the dearness of provisions.[4] But in 1650 the district felt the effects of the Fronde. Turenne had declared for Condé and held Stenai in his interests. Taking advantage of the embarrassment of the government from these revolts, the Spanish invaded France. Plessis Praslin marched to meet them, and his army of 15,000 men was for nine days at Marle. The country was laid waste for four leagues round. On the 6th of August, Plessis Praslin left the town, and on the 13th it was captured by the Spanish. Its inhabitants were promised their honor and their lives, but the Spaniards left them very little else. A special contribution of 1,000 livres saved, however, the decorations of the great clock of the church. The

[1] *Ib.*, 30, 31. [2] Relation de Marle, 29–35.
[3] Diocèse de Laon, 34. [4] Relation de Marle, 39.

Spanish evacuated on the 15th of August, but sickness followed, and from then till December eight hundred persons died. Two hundred more would have died of hunger had it not been for the charitable labors of the priests of the Mission, acting under the direction of Saint Vincent de Paul. The notary found one consolation amid the miseries of the time, for he entered at the end of his journal for 1650, that this year by the mercy of God and the zeal of the Company of Jesus, China had been converted to the faith of its emperor and all of his court baptized.[1]

The reports sent by the priests employed in charitable work in the diocese of Laon describe the condition of other towns in it. At Montcornet, where there were three hundred families, seven hundred persons had died. Neither laborers could be found, nor horses nor oxen, for working the fields. Seventy houses had been burned at Marjot out of one hundred and ten. Men and women who had been mutilated were numerous in the diocese. For almost a year many had eaten only roots and spoiled fruit. Some had occasionally obtained bread so bad that hardly a dog would eat it. Some were found in caves in which they had taken refuge. In the faubourgs of Saint Quentin the houses had been burned. Twenty-five mud huts had been put up, and in each of them the missionaries found two or three sick, and in one of them ten. Two women and eight children were lying on the ground in one hut, entirely without clothes. Of the curés of the diocese, eighty had died and one hundred had been forced to leave. During the winter it was said that every day as many as two hundred persons died of hunger in the provinces of Picardy and Champagne.[2]

"For sixteen years," the notary writes in 1651, "the misery of the city of Marle had been such as could hardly be described or imagined, but it was necessary for the

[1] Relation de Marle, 35–47.

[2] Relations, etc., Diocèse de Laon, 47–71. These relations are the reports sent by the missionaries to their principals, and they are uniform in their tone. Nothing could be more authentic or trustworthy.

troops of the king to oppose the enemy, and it was usual that the enemy themselves should pillage a country they entered. The inhabitants had suffered their misfortunes as the natural results of war, but their patience was exhausted when these evils were increased by the ravages of rebels against the king." During all the summer of 1651 Marle was occupied by the troops of the Prince of Condé. Of two hundred and fifty houses in the faubourgs, one hundred were burned. The officers were engaged in constant debaucheries, and made havoc of the houses in which they took their lodgings. The air was full of execrations against the queen and the cardinal, and all were compelled to cry, "Long live the Prince of Condé!" Those who complained of the pillage of their houses were called Mazarinites, and treated accordingly. The soldiers marched out to plunder the neighboring country in bodies of twelve or fifteen hundred men, with drums beating, and their officers at the head. Every night from the city walls the light could be seen of burning houses, or barns, or of entire villages. From the 13th of August to the 7th of September eleven villages were pillaged. At Houry a body of fifteen hundred men first burned the village and then burned the church in which the inhabitants had taken refuge. The people escaping were, for the most part, only plundered. But two men and one woman were killed, and some of the women were violated.[1] At Laon the governor testified that over two thousand five hundred people were incessantly asking for relief, and many died in the hospitals and in the streets.[2]

The year 1652 brought no change. The Duke of Lorraine led his troops to Paris, but their pillaging was mostly carried on south of Marle. The Spaniards, however, marched near Laon in their endeavor to join Condé's forces in Guienne, and were encamped there for some time. The accounts of their conduct are the same as in other years. There was no longer much in the diocese to plunder. Of three hundred parishes it was said that one hun-

[1] Relation de Marle, 49–69. [2] Diocèse de Laon, 71.

dred and fifty had been abandoned. Many had left Marle because they had no means of subsistence there. Those who remained had to live on bread made of oats and barley. Even those who had been the richest of the residents could no longer collect their rents, and commerce was destroyed. They were satisfied with bread of which half or two thirds consisted of barley and peas.[1] "It is with sorrow," the notary writes at the beginning of 1653, "that I describe the miseries of my country, and I regret that I have begun, for I see no end to our misfortunes. The pen falls from my hand, and I am almost resolved to cease a work which can only cause pain to our successors."[2] In this year more troops were in the diocese than at any other time. The soldiers of the king, of Condé, and of the Spanish archduke were all there, and some of the armies contained as many as 35,000 men. The king's forces, under the marshal La Ferté Seneterre, committed ravages equal to those of the enemy. The inhabitants asked for protection, but the marshal only answered that the soldiers must live. There was but little difference the next year. Troops were stationed at Marle for 167 days, and the notary makes a detailed calculation of how much they cost the town. Among the expenses are 10 sous a day for each of 70 valets, and the same amount per day for 30 women. Even 60 dogs had to be supported at 3 sous each a day. In all it cost Marle 94,686 livres and 10 sous. Besides this about 30 small houses were destroyed and 1,200 trees.[3]

The country was exhausted. Those who had been worth 60,000 livres were now without bread. Nothing but straw to sleep on was left for most of the inhabitants of the country. There were six hundred orphans under twelve in the small city of Laon.[4] The Prince of Condé established

[1] Relation de Marle, 78–95. Diocèse de Laon, 78.

[2] Relation de Marle, 95–8. This outbreak is curious, as the most of this journal of misery is written with extraordinary dryness. The facts are put down with no more comment than as if it were a book of account. But eighteen years of unbroken misfortune exhausted the most patient.

[3] Relation de Marle, 95–135.

[4] Diocèse de Laon, 85, 86.

himself at Rocroi, and from that town pillaged and levied blackmail on the country. After 1656 this district was less afflicted by the passage of armies. In 1659 peace was made. For the last few years of the war little record is found of the condition of the diocese. It was so exhausted that the inhabitants had no longer the energy even to recount their misfortunes. In 1660, it was said that not only here, but in all Picardy, Champagne, and Lorraine, it was rare to find a house where there was sufficient bread, that a bed covering was seldom seen, that the well and the sick slept on straw, and had only their rags to cover them.[1]

In the diocese of Laon during each year, for over twenty consecutive years, troops were quartered, forced levies were exacted, and some portion of the crops was destroyed. The twenty years are an unbroken record of pillage and plunder, houses burned, crops destroyed, men murdered, and women violated.

It may be thought that Laon and Marle from their position were specially exposed to the passage of armies, and that they suffered more during these years than the rest of France. But an equally detailed relation would show a similar condition in a vast number of districts. When civil war was added to the misfortunes of the time, hardly a province of France escaped disturbance and pillage. Even those portions which were entirely free from the presence of soldiers, were so burdened by taxation and the disorders caused by the war, that their condition was little better than that of Alsace or Picardy. Lorraine, which was not yet indeed a part of France, but was gradually becoming incorporated with that kingdom, lay between the combatants, and was the battle-field for all. It was ravaged equally by the soldiers of its own duke, and by those of the Spanish, the Swedes, and the French. At one time there were six armies and 150,000 soldiers upon its fields. The town of Saint Nicholas in 1630 was a flourishing place of 10,000 people. It had local fairs

[1] Recueil Thoisy, 1660, t. xiv.

and a considerable trade in jewelry. It was enriched also by frequent pilgrimages of the pious to its shrines. At the end of the war it had but a few hundred people left.[1] The poor of Lorraine, other relations tell us, died of hunger; bread sold for a franc the loaf, and the people lived on acorns and roots. The wolves came from the great forests, and accustomed to feed on the bodies that lay exposed in many parts, they often attacked and devoured women and children. Eighty villages were deserted and ceased to exist. The glass-works of Damey were closed, and many flourishing industries disappeared.[2]

Alsace was in like manner suffering the evils that attend the transfer of a province from one government to another, and its condition was as bad as that of Lorraine. Bourbonnais was further removed from the scene of war, but it suffered from the civil commotions and from famine and disease. "The people are in great terror," writes a contemporary, "because there is a rumor that Monsieur is to pass through this country with a large army. God give us soon a good peace, and incline the king to succor his poor people, who are now in extreme distress."[3]

Normandy also was free from the pillage of soldiers, except during a year or two of the Fronde, but taxation was especially onerous in that province. The chancellor's sister wrote him that the prison of Pontoise was full of persons confined for non-payment of the taille, and they were consumed by misery. The rich paid less than the poor, and the receiver of Gisors was becoming wealthy from the oppression of the defenceless. "Grant justice to the oppressed," wrote the Carmelite, "and God will grant you mercy."[4] Twenty-one years later the receiver of Gisors was at last brought to trial for robbing the public, and seven hundred witnesses testified against him.[5] A bad

[1] "Description du Feu et du Pillage de Saint Nicolas," written by a witness and published by Marchal.

[2] "Depopulation de la Lorraine." "Histoire de la Réunion de la Lorraine à la France." [3] Printed in Cabinet Historique, t. vi.

[4] Lettre de Sœur Jeanne de Jesus, Carmelite indigne. Mss. Bibl. Nat.

[5] Lettre de Guy Patin, Dec., 1664.

harvest in 1648, and the destruction of the crop by the troubles of the Fronde in 1649, bred a pestilence. The hospitals were so crowded that eight and ten were put in one bed, and sometimes a living person was found in the midst of corpses.[1]

Champagne was exposed to the ravages both of civil and foreign war. In three years Rethel sustained four sieges, and the enemy passed through the country five times. The governor of the troops at Sainte Menehould in 1652 notified the neighboring towns to furnish a certain amount of grain, in default of which they would be pillaged and burned. In August, 1653, a correspondent writes that the garrison made constant excursions, and carried off the corn and sheep. Nineteen persons had been captured within eight days, and were held for ransom. At one time but fifty-three of its inhabitants remained at Sainte Menehould.[2]

Picardy lay very near to the scene of the war in the Spanish Netherlands, and its sufferings had little intermission. An illustration of the customs of the time is found in a letter from the French garrison at Saint Quentin to the city officers. The soldiers said they had protected the city for five months, but they had received no pay. They regarded themselves as deserving a reward for their pains, and they notified the officials that if they did not soon receive their back pay, they had resolved to plunder the best shops and the market, and set fire to the city in four quarters.[3] Such messages were not simply a grim joking, but the soldiers only too often executed their threats. In 1652, the inhabitants of Saint Quentin and other towns in Picardy and Champagne were reduced to such a condition that they had nothing with which to plant and cultivate their fields, except as they received charity from Paris. From regard to their needs, the Parliament extended for a year the time for the payment of

[1] Recit de ce qui s' est passé en les hôpitaux de Saint Louis et Saint Roch. Mss. Bibl. Nat. [2] Relations, etc. Arch. Nat. K. K., 1072.
[3] Bibl. Nat. Mss. Col. Picardie, t. lviii.

their debts, and directed the release of all levies that had been made.[1] Near Rethel, some of the villages organized for their own defence. A Scotch regiment of one thousand men was stationed there in 1651. The crops in the vicinity had been so injured by them and other troops that rye sold for one dollar and fifteen cents a bushel. One Oudard acquired some reputation as a guerilla captain, and with about two hundred peasants he undertook the defence of the towns, and of the residences of some of the nobles which were threatened with assaults. He stationed his men advantageously, from his knowledge of the country and the woods, and carried on a small war with the soldiers, when they attempted plundering expeditions. No quarter was given, and when they captured any of the soldiers, although they were in the employ of the French government, they slaughtered them at once. Disease came at the end of such a year as this. Food was so dear that those living in the best houses had to be content with bread made of oats and barley, and occasionally some meal soup, and dysentery raged during the autumn.[2] The peasants who had taken up arms in their own defence presently themselves became highwaymen. Oudard and his nephew were at last captured and hung.

The disorders of the Fronde continued in Guienne longer than any other part of France, and that province suffered very severely. Discontents had long been rife in that section. In 1643 a superintendent wrote the Chancellor from Gascony that he found disorders in every quarter. The people paid their taxes with reluctance, and there was hardly an officer who was not guilty of many abuses. He feared trouble, and it soon came. The inhabitants seized some of the tax-collectors and plunged them in a kettle of quick-lime used by the tanners for hides. They escaped half boiled, and a sedition followed.[3] The oppression practised by Épernon irritated the

[1] "Misère au Temps de la Fronde," 364.

[2] Bibl. Nat. Mss., Rheims, t. vii.

[3] Bibl. Nat. Mss. fonds Germain, 709, 8–34.

people still more, but the Fronde only made their condition worse. The country was wasted by the soldiers and the pestilence. In 1652 it was said that half the population of Agen perished from disease, and that there were eight thousand deaths at Montauban.[1]

Donjon was threatened by two thousand soldiers of Condé, and immediately after them came three companies of cavalry, who are characterized as cruel devils, and who, for seven days, robbed the town and held inhabitants for ransom, in order to compel the payment of the arrears of the taille for three years.[2] The official reports of the condition of towns show the extent of the ravages more clearly than loose complaints. Auxonne, in 1646, had a population of only 618, of whom 144 were widows, and 141 peasants that had fled from the country. It contained 417 houses, of which 120 were uninhabited. The roads were bad; many of the inhabitants slept on straw; the bridge was in ruins, and the town owed 160,000 livres. It had been reduced to this condition, partly by the war, and partly by violent epidemics in 1636.[3] Auxonne is now a prosperous place, with good roads and bridges, and a population of five or six thousand. The little city of Langon was captured and recaptured during the Fronde in Guienne. Its inhabitants had a detailed statement prepared of the houses that had been destroyed. In the Rue de la Mer, ten had been burned or destroyed; in the Rue Biron, eight; and in the Rue Saint Gervais, the church and ten houses burned, and the windows and doors destroyed of the others. In this manner the amount of the devastation is traced from street to street; the place had not been sacked, but such were the results of the casual and wanton damage inflicted by two armies. Accounts such as this, year after year, can be collected in almost every province in France. War and taxes so reduced the condition of the people that, in 1655, an English correspondent wrote that the people were weighed

[1] "Misère au Temps de la Fronde," 479, 480.

[2] Registres paroissiaux du Donjon. [3] Procès Verbal de 1646.

down with poverty, tailles, and all sorts of impositions; yet they preferred to suffer them all rather than have war.[1] Mother Angelique wrote the queen of Poland, in 1654, that the general misery was such, that there were few artisans; where the ravages of the war had been, they had been killed or scattered, and it was difficult even to find men to cultivate the fields. Some artisans could be obtained from Normandy, where the taille was so heavy, that it would be easier than in the other provinces to get men to leave, and go even to Poland. Many laborers had been ruined by the taille, and had been driven to abandon their homes.[2]

In 1659, the appeals for aid were as urgent as during the years of the civil war. Extraordinary misery was found in Burgundy, Picardy, and Lorraine. Even in the environs of Paris, men would dispute with the dogs for a dead animal found in the streets. Of 200 persons in one village, 180 had no bread. It was believed that 10,000 had died of need, and, unless aid was given, the men would not be able even to cultivate the crops. Pestilence would be bred by insufficient nourishment, and would ravage Paris, as well as the country. In Berry, another wrote, people were dying of hunger. The faces of those one saw were pale, livid, and death-like. The people lived on herbs, with occasionally a piece of black bread. In 15 parishes, there were 1,500 sick people, lying on straw and eating roots boiled in water, with no salt. The fields were full of men, almost naked, sick, starving, hunting for roots or for the dead body of some animal.[3]

The records have been kept of the leases of several pieces of property near Sens; they show that land which yielded an income of 18 livres an acre in the sixteenth century yielded but 6 livres from 1650 to 1660. In 1860, four times as much income was received from the same land.[4]

---

[1] Paper cited in "La Misère au Temps de la Fronde," 502.

[2] Letters to Queen of Poland, Jan. 28 and April 1, 1654.

[3] Relations of 1659 and 1660; there was a bad crop in 1660.

[4] Published in Revue Archéologique de Sens, vi., 150–191.

The years of the Fronde were so attended by the misfortunes created by civil war, that the effect is shown in the records of births. At Arnay from 1648 to 1650 the average number of births was 110. It sank to 86 in the years from 1650 to 1654. In 1652 there were but 65, a figure which was not reached again until the famine of 1693. At Limours in the center of France, from 1647 to 1650 there were 32 births a year on the average and 28 deaths. For the next three years the births averaged 23 and the deaths 58. At Dreux the mortality went from 260 to 400, and in 1651 there were 551 deaths. The births had decreased from 265 to 189.[1] Most of these records show a condition of exceptional misery, caused by foreign or domestic war, by taxation of great severity, by famine, plague, and inundation.

The entire country was not always in a condition such as this, or it would have again reached the state of France during the English wars. But there were general causes which kept the mass of the people always poor and often miserable, and the calamities which aggravated their lot were of frequent occurrence. War raged during a large proportion of the time. Taxation was almost always of crushing severity. Among ignorant laborers, with poor commercial regulations and industrial appliances, bad crops were frequent. A bad crop among a poor people, with the means of communication expensive and difficult, meant a famine, and famine bred pestilence. "Under Henry IV. France was in advance of us in all things." Arthur Young wrote late in the 18th century, "Thanks to liberty, we have changed the rôle."[2]

The French peasant and laborer of to-day, if we compare him with his ancestor two centuries ago, eats a larger loaf of better bread; his house is lighter, larger, and drier; he has more salt and sugar with his food; he does not fear

[1] Many figures from various towns are collected and published in "La Misère au Temps de la Fronde," 369–373. It is difficult to find trustworthy records of births and deaths at this period.

[2] I quote this from recollection, but this is the idea if not the exact wording.

that he will be imprisoned for his taxes, nor that the landlord will whip his son or the collector insult his daughter; he occasionally has meat for his dinner; he has his voice in the choice of the representative who shall fix the amount he must pay the government; he drinks more wine, of a better quality; and he smokes his pipe with contentment, as he surveys the piece of land that is his own. The sufferings of the past were so sharp that years have not softened their remembrance, and he indulges in no repinings for the "good old times," and as he considers the difference in his lot he is equally thankful for the industrial improvements of this century, and for the social revolution of seventeen hundred and eighty-nine.

CHAPTER XIX.

SOCIAL LIFE AND CUSTOMS.

In considering the customs and modes of life of the classes which were raised above the necessity of manual labor, the nobility naturally first attract our attention. The body of the nobles was a very large one, and it was estimated that it contained in all as many as four hundred thousand persons. In Poitou alone the superintendent reported there were fifteen hundred gentlemen,[1] and with their families there must have been several thousand of gentle blood in this small province. Not only were all members of noble families noble, but nobility had been profusely granted to officials of many classes. Many also assumed the rank without being entitled to it, in order to obtain social position and to enjoy exemption from taxation. Frequent investigations were ordered as to the real status of such offenders, but they were usually abandoned.

An aristocracy must be rich in order to hold its position and influence, and the incomes of many of the nobles were large for the period. Except for a few great nobles, and for those whose connection with the Court led them to an absurd extravagance, living was relatively cheaper then than now. The wages of servants were low, and many modern sources of expense had not been discovered. Persons of good position could live with comfort on sums which would now be utterly inadequate. The

[1] Rapport sur Poitou, 25. Including all officials who were ennobled, I think 400,000 is not too high a figure. The older nobility who held land, as distinguished from the new men who held office, constituted probably over half of this body. The line which legally separated the noble from the plebeian was loosely drawn.

figures seem moderate, even when we remember that prices on an average were one third of what they are now. A little later, in 1678, Mme. de Maintenon estimated the sum upon which a family of good position could live, keeping ten servants and four horses, at twelve thousand livres—about one thousand pounds, or five thousand dollars. A family could not live now in any great city and support such an establishment for five times that amount. The manner in which this sum was to be divided shows the difference in modes of life. One thousand livres went for rent, one thousand for servants, and one thousand for the dress of madame. Six thousand livres was allowed for the table, and three thousand for the dress, expenses, and magnificence of monsieur. In 1657, five or six thousand livres was considered a good income on which to marry.[1] A century later Arthur Young said that for eight thousand livres, a gentleman could live in the country and keep four servants and three horses.[2] In the society of the small cities, which consisted of officials, professional men, and prosperous bourgeois, the expenses of life were still smaller. The Archbishop of Poitiers had an income of forty-two thousand livres, and, as was said, this was very large in a city where the richest families had usually only three or four thousand livres ($1,200 or $1,600) a year. There were but two or three families that had incomes of seven or eight thousand.[3] A gentleman who was content to stay at his home in the country needed only a valet or two, and he did not startle his village by riding through it adorned with embroideries or tinsel, like a courtier in Paris.[4]

It is impossible to give the average incomes of so large a body as the nobility. In Poitou, in 1664, many are reported with incomes of twenty or thirty thousand livres (forty or sixty thousand francs). Many others had as little as eight or ten thousand livres. Some, it was said, in Lorraine had incomes of less than two thousand

[1] Journal d'un Voyage à Paris, 152. [2] Travels in France, i., 206.
[3] Rapport sur Poitou, 4. [4] Address to Assembly of Notables in 1626.

livres, but they were usually those who had fraudulently assumed the rank of nobility. There were fewer nobles then, than a century later, who had for their patrimony only their titles and their pride.[1]

Many received enormous incomes, partly from their lands, and partly from the offices and pensions bestowed on them by the king. In 1650 the incomes of the Princes of Condé and Conti and of the Duke of Longueville amounted altogether to nearly two million livres.[2] Condé alone left property yielding nearly a million a year, besides his governments.[3] Mademoiselle of Orleans, who was said to be the richest princess in France, had an income of three hundred and thirty thousand livres.[4] This was not enormous, as its actual money value would not be over one hundred and thirty thousand dollars. The great incomes were largely derived from pensions or the salaries of offices. The rents of the land were often a small proportion of the receipts of a rich nobleman, and investments in personal securities were unknown among the aristocracy. The Duke of Orleans had an income of a million livres, of which only one hundred thousand came from his land.[5]

The government paid several millions annually in pensions. Most of the powerful nobles received large sums in this way, and almost all of them who had any standing at the Court received something. These gifts were sometimes made in the form of offices, and sometimes by granting monopolies of some branch of trade. While trade was disgraceful, yet, if some monoply was granted by the king, the noble could avail himself of that without derogating from his rank. It was felt that the government should in some way come to the relief of the nobles when in need of money. The Princess of Condé asked for some little monopoly to be granted her to pay some

[1] Rapports sur Poitou et Touraine, *passim*.

[2] Lionne to Le Tellier, April 3, 1650, printed in Mém. de Molé, iv., 380.

[3] Mém. de Motteville, 109. Journal d'Ormesson, 372.

[4] Mém. Orleans, 570. [5] *Ib.*

of her debts.[1] One lady had the monopoly of Sedan chairs, and another of the hangings used at the funerals of bourgeois in Paris.[2]

But these large sums were drawn from the treasury by nobles who spent a great portion of their time at the Court. Life there was growing more expensive, and the extravagance of the courtiers was excessive. A nobleman complained that they would all be better off without any pensions, for the country gentleman, who lived quietly at home with one valet, came up to Paris in the hope of obtaining a pension, and there had his squire, two gentlemen in attendance, and many pages, was covered with plumes and gold lace, and consumed his whole income in two or three months.[3] Those of still higher position lived in great splendor, and usually spent more than they received. A few thrifty nobles like the Prince of Condé accumulated great fortunes, but the majority of them disdained to save their money. Most of it came easily and was spent recklessly. The Duke of Guise spent 30,000 livres on a ball; an extravagance as great as spending $30,000 now. His affairs were greatly embarrassed at the time, but it did not disturb him.[4] That was a matter for his superintendent to see about. Bassompierre received a visit from the king, and he spent as much as this in entertaining him with magnificence.[5] When Retz went on a political mission to Compiegne, he had seven tables served and spent 2,400 livres, or a thousand dollars, a day.[6] Very many servants were kept by all, and the great nobles had about them a little court, composed of servants, and gentlemen who were their retainers and bore the same relation to them that the courtiers did to the king. Richelieu complained of the extravagance of his nephew, who had six secretaries and six valets-de-chambre. He insisted that his establishment should be reduced to forty-four servants in all. Three thousand livres a month must answer for

[1] Let. de Richelieu, vi., 869. [2] Edit de Mai., 1645, arrêt Dec., 1634.
[3] Address to Assembly of Notables, 1626. [4] Journal à Paris, 56.
[5] Bassompierre, 129. [6] Mém. de Retz, iv., 100.

the expenses of the table and horses, and the nephew must live on 50,000 livres a year. If he could not live on that at Marseilles, the cardinal said that all the money in the world would not suffice.[1]

The result of extravagant living was often an enormous indebtedness. Bassompierre owed 1,600,000 livres and had no money with which to pay his creditors.[2] It had been incurred by lavish expenditure, keeping a great establishment, dressing in the pink of fashion, and entertaining with magnificence. The queen gave Mme. de Chevreuse over 200,000 livres to pay her debts. Pont de Courlay, Richelieu's nephew, ran in debt 400,000 livres in ten years by his profuse mode of living.[3] The Fronde in Guienne was unable to raise money because the noblemen who supported it were already greatly in debt, and as their reputation for paying what they owed was very poor, no one was willing to advance money upon their credit.

The dress of the time was very different from our own, and that worn by people of fashion was very expensive. While the dresses of the ladies were often costly, the greatest expenditure was on the clothes of the men. Society was still in the condition where the male seeks lustre from a gorgeous habiliment. Many edicts were issued against this extravagance. These declared that the French were consuming their estates in an excessive passion for luxury and dress.[4] Gentlemen were sometimes arrested and the unlawful finery taken from them.[5] But the edicts had no effect in checking such customs. A cloak adorned with gold lace cost 800 francs or $160. The dress of a gentleman of good fashion would cost 3,000 or 4,000 francs, and that worn on great occasions would cost 10,000 francs, or more. At the baptism of the Duke of Orleans the dress worn by the Marshal of Bassompierre

[1] Let. de Richelieu, v., 481, 3, 503, 4, vii., 800.
[2] Bassompierre, 97.
[3] Let. de Richelieu, v., 481.
[4] Declaration of November, 1639. Molé, iv., 194, i., 148.
[5] Voyage à Paris en 1657.

was of violet and cloth of gold. It was covered with pearls, and, with his sword adorned with diamonds, his entire dress cost 114,000 francs. He had but 4,000 francs with which to pay for it; but he won 30,000 francs at cards at one sitting, and afterwards gained enough to pay for it all.[1] When Turenne was at Court as a young man he wrote his mother that he was in a sad plight, having only a dress of black and one of red, while those of the least importance were ashamed to be seen twice at great balls, in dresses that had cost 4,000 and 6,000 francs. They were ruining themselves, he said, for things which added little to a man's reputation.[2] White plumes on the hat, and red shoes, showed that their wearer belonged to the Court.[3]

The dress of the ladies was rich, but, except in the difference of fashions, does not present so much contrast with that of more modern times. Powder and rouge were then used liberally, and ladies ate lemons to make them pale. There was much luxury in gloves, and some insisted that three hours was as long as a pair should be worn.[4] Ladies of wealth had many diamonds and precious stones. When Mme. de Longueville and her daughter went to Münster, they carried with them jewels costing over 600,000 francs.[5]

Masques were often worn by ladies. Introduced at the end of the sixteenth century, they came gradually into use, and became very common during the Fronde. In theory they shielded the face from the intense gaze of inferiors, and in practice they were often convenient for ladies devoted to politics and gallantry. The usage was confined to the upper classes. Politeness required that the masque should be raised in the presence of one of superior rank. Loret tells us that the ladies wore masques when driving on the Cours la Reine, but when the king passed, five hundred beautiful faces exposed their charms.[6]

[1] Mém. de Bassompierre, 49, 50. [2] Let. of Feb. 22, 1631.
[3] Tallemant, i., 36. [4] *Ib.*, i., 128; v., 100. Let. de Richelieu, iv., 296.
[5] Voyage à Münster, 2. Mém. de Motteville, 84.
[6] Muze Historique, May, 1655.

In 1664, Mme. de Sévigné speaks of going masked to watch her friend Fouquet, when he was taken to the arsenal. The custom, however, disappeared in the latter part of the reign of Louis XIV. For a man to keep on his hat was still the privilege and the practice of the nobles. They wore them even when they ate and when they danced. A book on etiquette in 1660 says that gentlemen should keep on their hats at table, except during the grace and the benedicite.[1] After the ballet, when the ladies had taken off their masques, the gentlemen put on their hats, and all danced together.[2] It was one of the reforms introduced by Mme. de Rambouillet, that at her salon usage required that the gentlemen should take off their hats.[3]

As serious employment could not be allowed, amusements were largely sought. Hunting was much followed. Louis XIII. was especially devoted to this sport, and gave to it a large part of his life. Game was abundant in the great forests which covered a considerable part of France. Deer, wolves, and wild boars were hunted on horseback, and birds of various sorts were chased by falcons. Animals were also shot, and Louis XIII. was a very accurate marksman. Hunting was forbidden to the roturiers, and it was exclusively the sport of gentlemen.[4]

But a very different and far more pernicious amusement occupied a large portion of the time, and the taste for it extended somewhat to other social classes. Gambling was universal among the aristocracy, and fabulous amounts were lost at play. At Court there were tables for cards both day and night, and ladies as well as gentlemen played for high stakes. Ancre lost 80,000 pistoles in one night. Orleans, Tubeuf and Cardinal Mazarin lost over half a million at a sitting. Gourville won 110,000 francs of the Duke of Richelieu in a few minutes. The duke sold a piece of land

[1] Traité de Civilité, Courtin. Tallemant, vii., 59.

[2] Journal de Dubuisson Aubenay, Feb. 23, 1648.

[3] Hist. Amoureuse des Gaules, i., 50.

[4] This prohibition was often repeated. It is found in edict of 1629. Anc. Lois, xvi., 280.

and paid the amount. M. de Crequi lost 600,000 francs, and it was charged that he only paid half the debt. Madame de Roquilaure lost 30,000. Her husband paid the money and told her to play no more.

Where many gentlemen ruined their estates by gambling, some clever young adventurers made their living out of it. Gourville says he played with care and won great sums. Henry de Campion tells us he lost at dice, but he abandoned what was mere luck, and being a good player at cards, he lived upon his gains for a long time. The Count of Guiche, who afterward became a marshal, wrote that when he came to Paris the courtiers and financiers had plenty of money, and played passionately and recklessly. This adroit young Gascon needed only to profit by his opportunities, and live in splendor without asking aid from his family. It was said that when he had become old and distinguished, he was as unfortunate at cards as he had been successful when a lad. In one year Bassompierre's net profits at tric-trac were 600,000 francs. Gallet won over 2,000,000 and died a beggar.[1]

The government declared that excessive play was ruining the best families, and endeavored to close the public gambling houses. But the highest play was at private houses. Some even extended their hospitality so far as to furnish the money with which their guests could bet. After a dinner with the Duke of Lerma, two bags, each with a thousand pistoles, were placed upon the table for the use of those who wished to play. If we can believe Retz, the taste extended to some of the judges, and he charges the members of the Parliament of Bordeaux with recklessly gambling.[2] In 1657 the ladies complained that the men were so devoted to cards, it kept them from parties and society.[3]

Duelling was somewhat checked by Richelieu, but the

[1] Mercure, 1617, 162. Ormesson, 336. Gourville, 529, 530. Voyage à Paris, 160. Campion, 117. Gramont, 237, 238. Bassompierre, 123. Tallemant, x., 6-8. There are innumerable references to high play in the memoirs of the time. [2] Richelieu, xxi., 43. Orleans, 602. Retz, ii., 231.

[3] Voyage à Paris, 53.

practice still continued. Nothing could be more frivolous than the grounds for these meetings, and nothing more ferocious than the encounters. One gentleman praised the memory of another. The latter said a good memory implied small judgment, and he insisted on a duel to avenge this affront.[1] The seconds must fight also, but gentlemen were reckless of life, and an invitation to act as a second was regarded as a favor. No less than twelve took part in one encounter, five seconds on each side.[2] Pontis says, that during the eight years of the regency of Anne of Austria, 935 gentlemen were known to have been killed in duels.[3] Even this was an improvement on the condition of affairs twenty years before, and during the reign of Louis XIV. this absurd and pernicious practice was largely checked. One brave but cruel gentleman, Richelieu said, had killed seventeen men in duels.[4] To be a gallant man was the great desire of a French nobleman, and the fear of forfeiting this title led him to many absurdities. La Tuye and Binau fought on horseback, and La Tuye was shot through the body. His horse turned and the wounded man could not control it. "You are flying," cried his adversary. La Tuye died on the same day, saying his only regret was that it could be said he had fled.[5] The same spirit made the bravery of the gentlemen in battle often become mere foolhardiness. The Marquis of Seneterre invited his friends to dine with him in the trenches of a city they were besieging. They dined there in the open air, finding a zest in the cannon balls that flew about them. Before the dinner was over a ball struck the marquis, and he was killed at table in the midst of his guests. Such exploits, which would now excite contempt, then aroused admiration. The brave man was not he who met danger when it was required, but who sought peril when it was useless. The young cavaliers committed innumerable acts of reckless bravado which often interfered with the discipline of the army, but

[1] Cited in D'Avenel, ii., 83. [2] Mém. de Bussy Rabutin, i., 196.
[3] Pontis, 655. [4] Richelieu, xxi., 246. [5] Tallemant, x., 12.

gained for them a reputation for daring. The French sought death, it was said, as if the resurrection were to-morrow.[1]

The nobleman of this time, though he was becoming a courtier, had not as yet entirely lost the roughness or the violent habits that belonged to the feudal era. Acts of violence were common, which a century later had become rare. There were various instances of women carried off by force, and detained by some gentleman and his retainers in defiance of their families and of the law. Mademoiselle de Sainte Croix, an heiress with eighty thousand francs a year, was seized by the friends of one lover and put in a convent to prevent her marriage with a rival. The father, with several men, attacked the convent; a crowd gathered, and four or five were injured.[2]

Doradour, with a hundred gentlemen, burst by night into the house of an artillery officer in Paris, and carried off his daughter. By appeals to Richelieu's influence, she was at last restored.[3]

The frequent struggles over precedence at public occasions often ended in violence. The Duke of Épernon quarrelled with the Archbishop of Bordeaux. He called him an insolent imbecile, and followed this by knocking off the archbishop's hat and beating him.[4] Bautru, of the Academy, had ridiculed the Countess of Vertus, and her men caned him and wounded him in the head.[5]

Even those whose positions would seem to forbid such excesses were sometimes equally violent. The members of the Parliament and of the Chamber of Accounts quarrelled about the order in which they should march at a procession in Nôtre Dame. First the judges pushed each other, and then they came to blows in the church, and it needed the officers to restore order.[6] Precedence was nowhere insisted upon with more vigor or violence than in church. Even Vauban, who was willing to give up

[1] Mém. de l'Abbé Arnauld, 518.
[2] Journal d'Ormesson, 471. Mch., 1648.
[3] Lettres de Richelieu, vi., 39.
[4] Mém. de Richelieu, xxii., 570.
[5] Tallemant, iii., 102.
[6] Mém. de Bassompierre, 356.

many of the privileges of the nobility, insisted that they should be distinguished by having separate seats given them in church.[1]

Education among the upper classes was often very superficial. From thirteen to sixteen the young noble usually began his military service. Before that, the two things which he studied most and understood best were riding and dancing. It was necessary that a soldier should ride well, and equally necessary that a courtier should dance well; and in these two accomplishments it was said the French masters exceeded those of all other nations. "Without dancing a gentleman can do nothing," said the professor in the Bourgeois Gentilhomme. "There is nothing so necessary as dancing." His statement was hardly exaggerated. Dancing was then a complicated art, and the graceful performance of long and involved figures showed the person familiar with good society. The Abbé Arnauld noticed the difference in the balls in Italy, where the ladies sat separate from the men, and their dancing was no more than walking in cadence.[2]

The brief studies of most of the young nobles left but a small trace of learning, and the education of girls was often still more neglected. After Richelieu's niece was married to the Duke of Enghien, she was sent to the convent of the Carmelites to learn to read and write.[3] Few of the great ladies of society and the Fronde could spell correctly.[4] It may be said that spelling had not then become an exact art, and people often spelled even their own names in different ways. There was indeed a circle of highly educated women at this time, but many of these were members of Parliamentary families.

An aristocracy that was idle, and of which a large por-

[1] Disme Royale, ch. 10.

[2] Mém. de l'Abbé Arnauld, 574. Life in Italy was in every way simpler than in France, and it was said that 100,000 livres there went as far as 300,000 in France. Let. de Richelieu, vi., 761.

[3] Mém. de Montpensier, 14. Let. de Richelieu, vi., 790.

[4] Cousin "Jeunesse de Mme. de Longueville," 23. The fact is apparent to any one who reads their correspondence, which has been preserved.

tion was unfitted for any active work except war, gradually lost its influence in the nation. Its members were lazy, agreeable, well-bred, and useless. In the sixteenth century the gentleman lived less at Court, and his estate was usually sufficient for the expenses which he incurred. But in the seventeenth century the life of the courtier had become expensive. Commerce and trade were forbidden. The lucrative offices were largely held by those of inferior birth, and except by pensions from the crown, it was impossible to replace the fortunes spent in extravagance. The judicial and most of the executive offices were not filled by members of the ancient aristocracy. This result was not produced entirely, or in large part, by any jealousy of the sovereign. Though they occasionally demanded some part of these lucrative and influential positions, the nobles really did not desire places that required industry and special training. It was justly said at the States-General in 1614, that it was not the paulette that kept them from the judicial offices, but because they had been trained to believe that study and learning were inconsistent with valor. Their influence slowly diminished. New men acquired great fortunes from the development of commerce or from dealings with the state. Writers ceased to be the dependents of great nobles, and began to exercise a large influence upon the public. The nobility continued to hold privileges which had become odious, without rendering services that should compensate for them, and without possessing the ability with which to protect them.[1]

At a great ball given by the chancellor in 1657, a foreigner familiar with French society said one could easily distinguish the daughters and wives of people of the city, or of the robe, from the ladies of the Court. The former in their air and bearing appeared like chamber-maids.[2] Allowing for some prejudice in the critic, his remarks were

[1] The causes of the decline of the French nobility are well discussed by the Vicomte d' Avenel in "La Monarchie Absolue," and by Taine in "L'Ancien Régime."

[2] Voyage à Paris, 1657, 411.

doubtless not wholly unjust. The daughters and wives of the merchants and judges were, for the most part, neither as well educated nor as well-bred as the same classes to-day. They were outside the charmed circle of perfect good breeding, and consciousness of the fact made them ill at ease. They could not attain to the perfect repose of manner of those who belonged to the aristocracy. They were disturbed by ordinary and domestic cares and troubles, and the gentlemen and ladies of the Court were raised above these.

However much such a life may have unfitted the nobility for being of use in the world, it doubtless perfected their manners. It is doubtful if the charm of manner and conversation which then existed in the best society of France can now be found in any class. Talleyrand said that only those who had lived before 1789 knew the charm of life. The changed conditions of a world, where all are so nearly equal, has rubbed off a certain ineffable grace. There are women now as beautiful as Mme. de Longueville, but it is doubtful if any possess her delicious languor of manner. When Arthur Young was at Paris at the beginning of the French Revolution, he spoke with amazement of the perfect unconcern of the nobles at events which were to decide the future of their own class and of the French monarchy. He dined with them when the National Assembly was organizing, and its members taking the oath of the Jeu de Paume. They talked about tennis and trinkets.[1] This was due in part doubtless to the want of any political knowledge. They felt the unconcern of children at political events, because they comprehended them no more than children. But they possessed also the breeding which enables one to meet the vicissitudes of life and the overthrow of fortune without change of countenance. They witnessed their own ruin with as much indifference of manner as they had witnessed the ruin of others. With unruffled faces they left the chateaux of their grandsires and the levées of their king to give dancing lessons in Piccadilly.

---

1 "[illegible]

The great value attached to many political and judicial offices has already appeared. Notwithstanding the large number of offices created, the prices paid for them increased rapidly. Some of them were, legitimately or illegitimately, very lucrative. All of them furnished a sure income and the sensation of official dignity, while from comparatively very few was any burdensome service required. The office of colonel of the Swiss guards sold for 800,000 francs; that of first gentleman of the chamber for 1,000,000, nearly four times as much as it brought 40 years before. For the chancellorship of the order of the Holy Spirit 340,000 livres or almost 700,000 francs were paid. The position of general of the galleys brought 1,400,000 francs.[1] The prices of judicial offices were equally high. The place of president à mortier of the Parliament of Paris was worth 1,000,000 francs, or nearly 200,000 dollars. The office of first president of the provincial Parliament at Grenoble brought only quarter of this sum. The office of master of requests sold for 400,000 francs, and 1,500,000 livres or 600,000 dollars was paid for the office of attorney-general.[2]

Even religious offices were sometimes transferred for a money consideration. The charge of grand almoner of the queen was sold to the bishop of Alet for 30,000 livres. Richelieu took the money and bought Limours. His bishopric of Luçon was also disposed of, after he had become cardinal, to the dean of Saint Martin of Tours. He received for it the deanery of Saint Martin and the abbey of Saint Vast, and also reserved a pension of five thousand livres on the revenues of the bishopric of Luçon. The deanery and abbey were stated to be worth seven thousand three hundred livres a year, and were to be conveyed clear of any charges. Each party agreed to obtain the consent of the king and the Pope to his own resignation, and to the

[1] 700,000 livres. Choisy, 585. Bassompierre, 329. Ormesson, 268, 492. The office of first gentleman, which sold for 550,000 livres in 1648, sold for 150,000 in 1609. Let. de Richelieu, vii., 93.

[2] Journal d' Ormesson, 6, 185, 426.

appointment of his successor. These transfers were executed in proper form and preserved among the official papers. There was no concealment about them, and apparently no feeling of any impropriety in selling or trading religious offices. A deanery or bishopric was transferred in as business-like a manner as a right to cut wood or pasture cattle.[1]

Corruption prevailed to a great extent, and bribes were given to those in positions, where now such practices are rare or unknown. The corrupt use of official position was almost universal. Prime-ministers, secretaries of state, superintendents of finance, all grew rich by practices that would now destroy the reputation of any public man, and which, even if they are occasionally discovered, are no longer common. Money was used to buy the support of cardinals and bishops of the church; it was distributed among the judges of the Parliament; it was given to the representatives of the provinces in their local States; even the favor of the Pope was purchased by abbeys for his nephew and money for his sister-in-law.[2] One hundred thousand livres were used in corruption among the deputies at the Protestant Assembly at Saumur.[3] Richelieu made out a list of the prominent Swiss who should receive "gratifications" from the French agents.[4] Mazarin's representatives reported to him the money they were obliged to spend in obtaining the election of a satisfactory archbishop of Mayence. Forty-three thousand five hundred livres were paid in all for the election. The Baron of Reissemberg had hopes of being chosen archbishop, but he agreed for ten thousand crowns to relinquish his own claims for ecclesiastical promotion, and to support the bishop of Wurtzburg instead of the bishop of Worms. Fifteen hundred livres had to be given the vice-chancellor of the archbishop of Treves,

[1] Lettres de Richelieu, vii., 525, 530, 531. The contract for the bishopric of Luçon is printed on page 531. These curious instruments have not, I think, been noticed by prior writers on this period.

[2] Numerous statements of such transactions are found in the letters of Richelieu and in the letters, and especially the Carnets, of Mazarin.

[3] Rohan, 497.

[4] Let. de Richelieu, viii.,367.

and the rest of the money was judiciously used among the clergy of the chapter.[1] Money was sent to Holland, and to the congress at Münster, to influence the representatives of other powers. Ninety-two thousand livres were paid the commissioners of Holland who had obtained for France a treaty with their own country.[2] Some English politicians, it has been discovered, were in the pay of Louis XIV. There was nothing extraordinary in such a thing at that era. In every country there were men of prominence who received money from other governments. While such dealings were, to some extent, kept secret, their discovery was not fatal to the reputation of those who had them. The fear of being placed in a compromising situation was little felt. An ambassador or a minister rendered friendly services to a foreign power, and it was only just that he should be paid for his good offices. Richelieu wrote the French ambassadors at London to employ money with the English who could be of service. The ministers had advised the cardinal that such a course would be judicious, and they were authorized to advance or promise whatever amounts they thought best.[3]

The dishonesty which existed among those who were officials of the government or had dealings with it, has already been noticed. There were some who were poor when they retired from public office, but they were a small minority; there may have been those who did not seek fraudulent or unconscionable gains when they contracted with the state, but their names have not been preserved.

There does not seem to have been much corruption in judicial decisions. The judges of the highest courts were rich, and the salaries and fees of their offices yielded a large income. They were beyond the reach of bribery in any ordinary litigation, and the most of them drew from the spirit of their order a stubborn independence, which could not be influenced by money. The government obtained the political support of some of the judges by

[1] Negociations Secrètes touchant la Paix de Westphalie, iii., 519–522. Reports of Vautarte.

[2] Lettres de Richelieu, v., 534.

[3] Lettres de Richelieu, ii., 254.

favors and pensions, but it did not ordinarily interfere with their judicial duties. The average character of the members of the provincial Parliaments was not equal to that of the judges of the Parliament of Paris, and there was more complaint of misconduct among them. Pontis describes a long litigation he had with a rich financier. He solicited all the judges and spared neither trouble nor money. His opponent spent in the controversy nearly 400,000 livres.[1] It was claimed that some of the judges favored officials and attorneys who brought suits before them, and thus furnished them the opportunity for gaining fees.[2] But usually the complaints were more of the delays of litigation and the large fees which the judges took, than of the corrupt decisions rendered by them.

Personal influences were, however, resorted to, and were not regarded as discreditable. When persons of distinction had important cases, their relatives aad influential friends would surround the judges as they came from court, and they received, without objection, private visits and personal solicitation. Richelieu wrote Molé that as the Seigneur Beauregard had rendered the king good service and was a friend of his own, he hoped that in the litigation he now had before the Parliament the first president would give him the most favorable decision that was possible.[3] Similar letters are often found in his correspondence and in that of persons of importance.[4] Such endeavors to influence justice were not thought improper in those who made them, or for the judges who allowed them. But it is probable that when such methods of persuading the judicial mind were suffered by the judges, the likelihood was small of a common man obtaining justice against a great prince.[5]

The nobility of the robe constituted a large and influential body. Not only their character and their habits, but even their dress, distinguished them from the nobility

[1] Mém. de Pontis, 518–521. [2] Rapport sur Touraine.
[3] Mém. de Molé, ii., 403, 404. [4] Lettres de Richelieu, ii., 433, *et pas.*
[5] See remarks of Florimond Rapine, *supra.*

of the sword. While the marquis was arrayed in a cloak of many colors, the president of the Parliament wore the black gown of the scholar. On occasions of special importance a gown of red marked his dignity, but the simplicity of his dress always contrasted with the elaborate and costly garments of the courtier. Though many judges had their country houses and lived in much splendor, still their ordinary mode of life was simpler than that of the class above them. There was also less immorality among them. Domestic tastes and virtues have generally prevailed among this class in France, as well as among the bourgeoisie. The character of the ladies who were among the leaders of the Fronde gives an air of license to the age, which did not extend through all ranks in society. The wives of the counsellors of the Parliament and the aldermen of the city were less bewitching, and more discreet.

The prices paid for judicial offices show how large the income must have been which was derived from them. A master of requests, holding a position of less dignity and value than a member of the Parliament, speaks of receiving sixty-three livres in one day for his fees.[1] This in money value would be nearly twenty-five dollars, and in relative value would represent seventy-five dollars for a day's work. The opportunity of earning a large income often came to a man very young. When only eighteen, the son of the former First President of the Chamber of Accounts received that important and lucrative office.[2]

The attorneys and solicitors who practised in these courts constituted altogether a large body, but apparently their average income was not large. Vauban estimates at 300 livres the average income of the attorneys.[3] This would be 600 francs, or 120 dollars, and is certainly not large. Many of course earned much more than this, but the satires of the time said that while a woman must have 30,000 livres for her dowry to hope to marry an advocate, and at least 75,000 before she could aspire to a counsellor

[1] Journal d'Ormesson, i., 8. [2] *Ib.*, 747. [3] Disme Royale, 84.

of the Parliament, 12,000 was quite enough to entitle her to marry an attorney. A president of the Parliament of Paris was regarded as so elevated a personage that he was placed at 300,000 livres, and in the same class with a duke or a genuine marquis.[1]

The physicians were at this time obtaining a better position. The practice of calling apothecaries, who had no medical education, and who sold their patients vast amounts of drugs, was gradually ceasing, and regular physicians were at once sent for by the patient.[2] The treatment which they inflicted was sufficiently severe. Bleeding was in full vigor, and one man was bled sixty-four times in eight months for rheumatism.[3] The pay received by physicians seems to have been moderate. Patin, who was among the leading physicians in Paris, regarded himself as handsomely paid when he received three livres, or about a dollar and twenty cents for a consultation.[4] A doctor of less standing did the bleeding that was required for the servants of Cardinal Retz for fifteen sous, or thirty cents, for each operation.[5] Physicians ordinarily rode on mules in making their visits.

Much earlier hours were kept then than now. A nursery rhyme declared that he who rose at six and retired at ten, would live to be ten times ten. The difficulty in obtaining sufficient light to make the evenings agreeable was perhaps one reason why most of the working hours were during the day time. The rich used wax candles, and at great balls and fêtes it was declared that the rooms were as light as the day. Wax was very expensive, and it was said that a gentleman, after losing great amounts at play, would go home, blow out a candle, and

[1] Roman Bourgeois, 33. The scale given of the fortune requisite for marriage, however imaginary, is good evidence of the relative social rank of various occupations at this time.

[2] Lettres de Guy Patin, i., 57–59. [3] *Ib.*, 353.

[4] *Ib.*, 4. Physicians curious about the practices and theories of their predecessors of this age, will find a great deal of information on the subject in these volumes of very agreeable letters written by Guy Patin.

[5] Tallemant, vii., 55.

reproach his butler for the extravagance in lights.[1] The most of the community were content with ordinary candles, and the poor used very imperfect oil lamps. Most persons were usually up at six. The courts ordinarily began their sessions at eight. Other public bodies met equally early, and a night session would have been regarded as very extraordinary. Processions of the courts and city officers started as early as half-past six.[2] Breakfast was served at seven, and the usual hour for dinner was twelve.[3] In the early part of the century it was sometimes at eleven. In the regulations given for a medical college, Richelieu directed that the students and doctors should dine at eleven and sup at six, and that the outer gate should be locked at nine and the keys kept by the dean.[4] The hour of dinner by the time of the Fronde was, however, often as late as one o'clock, and the supper at seven or eight.[5] Louis the XIV. dined at twelve, but his attendants had to wait until he had finished, and Mme. de Sévigné said that by one o'clock she was famishing.[6] Children as old as ten were in bed by seven o'clock.[7]

The meals that were eaten varied, of course, with the wealth of the family. The heavy pomp of the feudal dinner was disappearing. Louis XIV. was fond of flowers, and they were used profusely at fashionable dinners, as well as at balls. Complaint was made of the luxury and expense of such entertainments. Patin speaks of fifteen courses at a dinner, as showing the excessive luxury of the age.[8] Even eight courses were regarded as making a very elaborate dinner. An ordinance of 1629 forbade having more than three services, or more than six dishes for each. Entertainments were often given by those who were to be received into some office, and the price of these was limited to 100 francs. Three livres a guest was the utmost that could be paid for the feast at marriages or

[1] Maréchal d'Estrées, Tallemant, ii., 55.
[2] Registres Hotel de Ville, ii., 370. This was in June.
[3] Molé, ii., 94. Retz, iii., 289. [4] Lettres de Richelieu, iv., 77, 1630.
[5] Registres de l'Hotel de Ville, i., 369. [6] Le Grand d'Aussy, i., 308, 309.
[7] Mém. de Montpensier, 9. [8] Lettres, i., 193.

any such festivities.[1] Such a law was not regarded, and the physicians complained that the Parisians ate and drank liberally, while taking less exercise than their health required.[2] Some dishes that are common now were not in use then. Potatoes had not been introduced into France. Even a century later, they were regarded as a dish fit only for the gross palate and vigorous stomach of the vulgar, but not adapted to more delicate tastes.[3] Peas, on the other hand, were esteemed a great luxury, and fabulous prices were paid for early green peas. Epicures of wealth and fashion would have peas on their tables, costing more than the choicest strawberries in mid-winter cost now. Madame de Maintenon wrote of the impatience to eat peas, the pleasure of having eaten them, and the anticipation of eating more. Oranges were also regarded as a great delicacy. The son in "L' Avare" says that he has purchased China oranges for his mistress, to indicate a costly delicacy. Ice was a great rarity. The man who used ice to cool his wine in the summer was looked upon as a Sybarite.[4] Tea was little drunk. It was introduced about 1636, but it made its way slowly. In 1648 a doctor read a thesis before the physicians to prove that the use of tea increased the sharpness of the intellect, but this view was not adopted by his brethren.[5] Chocolate was introduced still later. Some said it first became familiar to the French on the marriage of Maria Theresa in 1660, but it was claimed that the cardinal of Lyons had used it seven years before. It was regarded with suspicion, as in the nature of a drug. Madame de Sévigné at first recommended its use to her daughter, but she wrote, afterwards, that it was accused of causing palpitation, and being very deleterious in its effects. Mme. de Grignan claimed, however, that she found it both beneficial and agreeable. Coffee was drunk in France in 1658, but it does not seem to have become at all popular, until the visit of the embas-

[1] Anc. Lois françaises, xvi., 264–5.
[2] Lettres de Patin à Plon, 353.
[3] Le Grand d' Aussy, i., 145.
[4] Le Grand d' Aussy, iii., 30.
[5] Lettres de Patin, iii., 116.

sador of the Grand Seigneur in 1669 made it fashionable among some classes. There were no cafés at Paris while Mazarin was minister, and their introduction came some years later.

Their place was filled by the taverns or wine shops, which were somewhat similar to the London chop houses. These were frequented by young nobles of the highest rank, who met there and discussed their pleasures and politics. When Beaufort and his companions were planning the murder of Mazarin in 1643, their consultations were generally held at a tavern.[1] The cardinal complained that his opponents, who called themselves the reformers of the state, were a class of men whose lives were spent in the taverns of Paris, and who mingled abuse of him with deep drinking and scandalous debauchery.[2] There was much excess during the years of the Fronde. Beaufort and Orleans were dissipated, Retz was not a severe moralist, and the ladies who were their companions were not strict in their views. At some of their festivities, it was said that both men and women indulged too freely in wine. The carnival of 1652 at Paris was attended with much excess, and the festivities of some of the leaders of the Fronde became orgies.[3] When the Marshal of Gramont was entertained at Munich by the Count of Kurz, the toasts were so numerous that the master of ceremonies and his guests were all under the table when the dinner was done. This was the German fashion, the marshal said, and when one was negotiating with them it was necessary to conform to their customs.[4] But though intoxication among the better classes in France was, perhaps, not as rare as it is now, it was not common, and their habits were more temperate than those of their English or German neighbors.

This era was fertile in producing new modes of amusement. It witnessed the first opera in France and the first

[1] Mém. d' Henri Campion, 231.

[2] Lettres de Mazarin à la Reine, 19. Letter of April, 1651.

[3] Aff. Etr. Fr., 139, p. 134.

[4] Mém. de Gramont, 264.

production of the plays of Corneille and Molière. The Italian opera was introduced by Mazarin, who was fond of such amusements, and desired those of his native country. Under Richelieu gorgeous ballets had been performed, filled with the elaborate allegory that gave pleasure at that time. These were, however, surpassed by his successor. In 1645 an Italian troupe appeared in the hall of the Petit Bourbon, a palace which was afterwards destroyed to make room for the enlargement of the Louvre. The opera was accompanied by decorations and changes in the scenery such as had not been seen in France, and by a very agreeable ballet.[1] In 1647 "Orpheus" was performed at the Palais Royal with great splendor, and at an expense which was estimated at four hundred thousand livres. It contained three acts and thirty-one scenes, and the elaborate allegory would be tiresome now, though both the dancing and the singing were good. It was seen with delight, says the *Gazette*, by the most beautiful and amiable prince in the world, while the plot, in which vice was always overcome by virtue, rendered it worthy of the approval of so pious a queen.[2] Signora Leonora of Rome was the prima donna, and Torelli had charge of the machinery. The piece lasted over six hours, and though it was pleasing to see once, from the changes and variety in the decorations, it became tiresome from its great length. The queen, however, did not miss one of the representations, which were given three times a week for two months, so great was her desire to please Mazarin and show an interest in the amusements which he devised. Many of the courtiers could not understand Italian, but all felt bound to listen with attention.[3] Ormesson gave the opinion of the Parisians, that the voices were good, but as the Italian could not be understood, it became wearisome.[4]

The opera was not legally established during Mazarin's life, but letters-patent for the organization of the Royal

[1] Palais Mazarin, 29.
[2] *Gazette*, 1647, 201–212.
[3] Mém. de Montglat, 176. Joly, 6.
[4] Journal d'Ormesson, 378.

Opera were afterwards issued by Louis XIV., and are still in force.

Ballets were often performed by the ladies and gentlemen of the Court, and were one of their favorite amusements. Their skill in dancing and taste in dress found an opportunity for display in such exhibitions. The great Condé appeared in the ballet, and gained applause as a dancer as well as a warrior. Those who took part wore masques and represented various characters—birds, animals, and the heroes and heroines of antiquity and romance.

Such entertainments were not thought consistent with religion by all. Severe doctors of the Sorbonne declared that to attend the opera was a mortal sin. But the opinion of twelve doctors was obtained, that if the piece contained nothing contrary to good morals it might be listened to with impunity, and the conscience of the queen was set at ease.[1]

The Italian comedy met with the approval of the Parisians. Persons who were not familiar with Italian declared the acting was so good that the pieces were interesting and could be followed with ease.[2] Ormesson describes a comedy in 1645, which was in advance of the plays to which the Parisians were then accustomed. The scenery represented the Pont Neuf and Place Dauphine, and also a city, and a garden with beautiful columns. Though there were but four or five feet of depth for the scenery, yet the perspective was so well arranged that the walks represented in the garden seemed to the spectators to be lost in the distance. Ballets were danced by persons dressed as bears and apes, and also as Ethiopians and parrots, and the rising of the sun was represented in a manner that was deemed marvellous.[3] The ballet was common at the theatres before the introduction of the opera, and there had long been a company of Italian comedians at Paris.

[1] Mém. de Motteville, 110. [2] Voyage à Paris, 197.
[3] Journal d'Ormesson, 340, 341.

The representations of the various troupes were sometimes more amusing than improving. An ordinance of 1641 forbade any immoral representation, or the use of any low phrases or *double entendres*, and directed that such breaches of good morals should be punished according to the discretion of the judges.[1] The theatres were increasing at this time in popularity, and the character of the pieces performed at some of them justly excited the admiration of all. In 1635 there were three theatres: one at the Hotel Burgundy, one at the Marais, and one in the Faubourg Saint Germain.[2] Theatrical representations were numerous also at the houses of the great nobles. At one at the Marshal of Estrées', all the gods and goddesses of the sea appeared in the ballet and celebrated the conquests of the king of France. In 1636 the *Gazette* tells us, that on January 24th Mademoiselle had a comedy acted for the queen at the Tuileries; on the 27th, "Clorisi," a comedy by Baro, was acted at the Hotel Richelieu with a ballet; on the 31st the Duchess of Rohan had a ball and comedy.[3]

What was more important for the history of the stage, the great plays of Corneille were performed for the entire public as well as for the Court, and they were warmly received. The criticisms of some of the literary men of the time did not prevent Corneille from gaining fame and popularity in his own day. Richelieu, whose literary taste was not accurate, delayed somewhat in his patronage, but he at last granted a pension, and the great dramatist was finally received into their midst by the literati of the Academy.

A still greater man won his success under Mazarin. After many disappointments, and varying fortune with his wandering troupe, Molière played before the king in the Petit Bourbon, and established his fame by "L'Etourdi" in 1658 and "Les Précieuses Ridicules" in 1659. His troupe had a long struggle with the theatres of the Marais and

[1] Arrêts du Parlement, April 24, 1641. Molé, iv., 230, 231.
[2] *Gazette*, 1635, 16. [3] *Gazette*, 1636.

the Hotel de Bourgogne, but the Theâtre Français when it was established was to be known to posterity as the theatre of Molière. The increase in the prices shows how different the representations were from those that had been given at Paris in the early part of the century. Then a seat in the pit at the Hotel de Bourgogne could be obtained for five sous, or ten to twelve cents. A seat in a box cost only twice as much. At the representations of "Orpheus" at the Marais in 1648, after the prices had been much reduced, a seat in the pit was twenty sous or forty cents, and the boxes cost a few crowns.[1] In 1657 the gentlemen of fashion paid four or five livres, or twice as many francs, for the chairs on the stage which they occupied. Loret says he paid thirty sous to see "Les Précieuses" at the Petit Bourbon, and had ten pistoles' worth of laughter.[2]

An institution of considerable importance in the history of French literature owes its origin to Richelieu. In 1635 letters-patent were granted for the establishment of the French Academy. It was organized under the protection of the cardinal, and was to consist of forty members, who were to devote their energies to the perfection of the French language.[3] This body had already been in existence since 1629, consisting of a number of literary men who met informally at the house of Valentin Conrart, and discussed questions of literature. It was not until 1637, and after repeated orders from the king, that the Parliament registered the edict for its organization. This opposition was probably due to the fact that some trifling legal immunities were granted the members, and they were given the right to have all actions to which they were parties brought before the masters of requests for trial. The body thus created has had a long career, and the honor of admission to it would be prized, even by those who criticise the value of the institution. There are not, how-

[1] Journal de Dubuisson Aubenay, Feb. 13, 1648.

[2] Muze Historique, x., 192.

[3] Anc. Lois françaises, xvi., 418–420. Let. de Richelieu, v., 957.

ever, many illustrious names on the list of the Immortals during the first twenty-five years of the Academy. Descartes, Pascal, Molière, Rochefoucauld, and Retz were not among its members.

An edict of 1617 directed two copies of every French book published to be deposited in the royal library.[1] This had received some attention from prior kings, but its growth had been slow. The ordinance was continued in force, and during the seventeenth century the *bibliothèque royale* began to increase with some rapidity, and it has at last become the greatest library of the world. The library of a few thousand books in 1617 now contains over two million printed volumes, and has the richest collection of manuscripts that is in existence.

Frequent copyrights secured to authors the right to the sale of their books, but the reading public was not numerous enough to make literature largely remunerative. Those works which could be represented on the stage had the best opportunity for gaining a fair return. A strict censorship of the press existed, but it was often disregarded.[2] The severest laws did not prevent the publication of countless pamphlets and bulletins containing the most violent, and often the most vulgar, abuse of the government and of all its members. Richelieu, and still more the regent and Mazarin, were abused with more venom than either public or private men are now subjected to in the sheets of the most scurrilous newspapers. The man who might be beheaded for his pamphlet naturally put enough sting in it to make it worth while to run the risk. Ten thousand pamphlets abusing the government, and full of atrocious calumnies, were issued during six months of 1649.[3]

The fertility of this period in satires and broadsides was accompanied by the beginning of an institution far more important than the French Academy. The *Mercure François*, which first appeared in 1611, though a valu-

[1] Anc. Lois françaises, xvi., 106.

[2] *Ib.*, 238.

[3] Journal de la Bibliothèque, June, 1649.

able source of information for history, cannot be regarded as a newspaper. It was a well-arranged current history of the times, appearing ordinarily in yearly volumes, from one to three years after the events it described. Such a chronicle was deemed too tardy, and in 1631 the *Gazette* appeared under the charge of Theophraste Renaudot, and may justly claim to be the first of French newspapers. The numbers appeared weekly, and consisted nominally of four pages smaller in size than those of a quarto volume. But extras were published on any important occasion, and often contained much more matter than the regular issue. The papers, bound together for a year, form a good-sized volume of several hundred pages. The *Gazette* contained a good deal of news from all parts of Europe, and full reports of battles, treaties, and court festivities. There were no advertisements and no editorials. In the description of events some comment upon them was occasionally introduced, but the paper was strictly an official organ. The battles in which the French were successful were promptly and fully described; their defeats were slightly noticed, and often after considerable delay. Internal events that were especially disagreeable to the government were often not noticed at all. One could read through the *Gazette* and hardly discover that there were any troubles of the Fronde. Many of the reports were put in under the direct order of the government. Louis XIII. amused himself by writing for it, and many of the pages which contain brief statements of the news of Paris and the Court were printed from manuscript which he furnished.[1]

Both in the letters of Richelieu and Mazarin are references to the manner in which the news should be stated in the *Gazette*, in order to produce the most favorable effect upon the public mind.[2]

It was not an independent organ, it indulged in no criti-

[1] A great number of them are now at the Bibliothèque Nationale, in the king's handwriting, with many erasures and corrections.

[2] Lettres de Richelieu, v., 669, 670. Let. de Mazarin, iii., 215, etc.

cism, but it gave the most of the news with reasonable promptitude for those times. It long continued the official paper of the French government. Other journals, however, sprang up and appeared with more or less frequency, some of them humorous in theory if not in fact, and some of them poetical. The most interesting of these was the *Muze Historique*, which was begun during the Fronde, and was for many years composed and published by Loret. This was in verse, and purported to be published for the amusement of Mademoiselle de Longueville, but it contained a fairly accurate account of the events of the time. Almost the entire history of the Fronde can be found in its pages, related with some prolixity, but in a manner that is usually rather agreeable. A newspaper in verse could hardly be expected to contain poetry of the highest order; but Loret rhymed with facility and his muse became a popular one. After the excitement of the Fronde was past, descriptions of balls and fêtes, and of the appearance of many of the notable guests, are often found in its pages. As soon as there was a public press which could describe private entertainments, those who gave them were quite willing to have it done, and flattering personal notices were found agreeable. The editor was given a place among the valets or the musicians, where he could see the ballet and describe the appearance of the more beautiful ladies. The pleasure of the sight, and an opportunity to partake of the viands prepared for the festivity, were a sufficient reward for his poetical labors in their description. When, however, persons wished notices of their entertainments, without seeing fit to give the journalist even this modest share in their enjoyment, he insisted on being paid for them.[1]

Not only the modes of life, but even the language, in many of the provinces differed widely from that of Paris. In many parts of France French was not spoken. The States-General asked that curés should not be appointed for these districts, who could not speak the language there

[1] Palais Mazarin, 133. Tallemant des Reaux.

used. Even in many provinces where French was spoken, there were few who talked Parisian French. Mlle. de Scudery undoubtedly met the best literary society of Marseilles, but she declares there were not more than six or seven ladies in the city who knew how to talk French.[1] When a well-written address was published by the Parliament of Bordeaux, it was thought it must have been composed in Paris, and that it was not probable there was any one living in Guienne who possessed sufficient literary skill.

Richelieu and Mazarin left their mark upon the architecture of Paris as well as upon the government of France. The selection of the places where they erected their palaces had much to do in determining the direction in which the city of Paris should grow. Had they preferred to go east, it was still possible that the future palaces and hotels of the nobility would have extended in the direction of Charenton and Vincennes. They chose, however, localities where, without being far from the Louvre, they could find room for extensive gardens. Fields with a few scattered houses then extended near the Louvre, in districts now traversed by the Rue de Richelieu and the Avenue de l'Opera. The present Rue des Petits Champs is one of the names which mark the former condition of this section. Richelieu destroyed the Hotel Rambouillet and two other houses, and erected the great Palais Cardinal, fronting on the Rue Saint Honoré. The city walls were at the same time removed, and placed where the boulevards are at present.[2] In the rear of this palace extensive gardens were laid out, which have since been covered by the buildings now included under the name of the Palais Royal.[3]

About the palace, many residences of nobles and political dignitaries were erected, and in this portion of the

[1] Lettre de Mlle. de Scudery à Mlle. de Paulet, Dec. 13, 1644, published by Cousin.

[2] The ordinance for this change is found in Anc. Lois françaises, xvi., 383, 1633.

[3] The extent of Paris at this time, and the position of the houses of importance appear on the map of Gomboust, published in 1652.

city most of the great families had their homes. Great improvements were made at this time in the construction of the city houses or hotels of the wealthy. These changes not only rendered them more handsome, but were especially intended to render them more comfortable. Windows were made larger, chimneys were proportioned to the fire that was needed, staircases became more roomy and convenient, the enormous size of some rooms was reduced and an endeavor made to construct a house in which one could live with convenience, without suffering from the cold.[1] Residences were becoming less feudal, and more modern, in their arrangement and construction. Those of the better class in Paris possessed an attraction which is now rarely found. All had gardens, and an abundance of flowers pleased the eye and made the air fragrant.

Landscape gardening was much cultivated during the reign of Louis XIV. Though the best known gardens of this time were laid out later than 1660, before that the taste began to develop for the stiff and artificial arrangement which became so universal. Beauty was added to them by the cultivation of flowers and rare trees. Orange groves were often found, and flowers were used profusely at all fashionable entertainments. The country houses of the nobility were also built more with reference to comfort, and had less of the traits of the feudal castle, and less of the bizarre ornamentation frequently seen in the previous century. This, however, still found admirers, and much praise was given to the great clock of the chateau of Anet, where twenty bronze dogs rushed out and barked at the bronze stag when the hours sounded.

Mazarin followed Richelieu in the resolve to build for himself a great palace, and in this respect he surpassed his predecessor. He also chose a location in the outskirts

[1] A marked change in the construction of French houses was begun by the historical Hotel de Rambouillet, erected in the early part of the century. It is fully described in "Antiquités de Paris," by Sauval, who had often been there, as well as by many other writers, who were there entertained.

of the city where there was plenty of land, and the Palais Mazarin was constructed a little west of the Palais Royal, and nearer to the city walls. Changing and greatly enlarging a building that then stood there, the architect Mansart erected for Mazarin, fronting on the present Rue des Petits Champs, the palace which now makes a part of the great building occupied by the Bibliothèque Nationale. This was ornamented with a splendor, which was not excelled by any of the royal mansions. Painters of celebrity were brought from Italy to decorate the walls, and the fresco paintings excelled those of any French palace. In the rear extensive gardens were laid out, between the Rue Richelieu and the Rue Vivienne. The cardinal was resolved to gather here treasures of all sorts. Mazarin had the tastes of an Italian, both for splendor and for art, and his patronage was more discriminating than that of Richelieu. His picture gallery contained five hundred paintings, among which were Raphaels, Titians, Correggios, and Van Dykes.[1] The collection of statuary was almost as fine.[2] There were brought to his palace from Italy furniture of ebony inlaid with ivory and rich stones, carpets from the Levant, mirrors and laces from Venice, porcelain from China. The magnificence of the tapestry and precious stones was admired by all. Along the Rue de Richelieu were constructed extensive and superb stables, which, with some changes, form a part of the building that still remains there. In these could be found carriages of every style from Rome and Florence, and horses and dogs from England and Spain.[3]

The work which, perhaps, most deserves commendation was the collection of a great library. Forty thousand

[1] Palais Mazarin, 16. Sauval, ii., 175.

[2] Long lists of these treasures of art are published in one of the Mazarinades. This said the statue of Charity was hidden in a corner, and that all the virtue that could be found in the palace was her representation on canvas.

[3] Palais Mazarin, 18. The rooms for the library were constructed above the stables, and the wits complained that Mazarin had put the Muses on a dung-hill. Tallemant, v., 149.

volumes were gathered together, many of which were very rare and valuable.[1] This would not now be regarded as a large library, but it was then. The Bibliothèque Royale then contained but ten thousand volumes, and it was not easy to obtain access to it. Great public libraries at this time were almost unknown. Mazarin had his placed in some of the halls of his palace, and it was kept open from eight till five. Every convenience was furnished for reading and writing. An inscription over the door which led to it, told all those to enter who wished to read. This great library was sold by parcels during the Fronde, but Mazarin collected another of about the same size. After his death, his palace was at last taken for the king's library, which is now the Bibliothèque Nationale. The books collected by Mazarin became the foundation of the Bibliothèque Mazarine, which is now in the buildings of the Institute.[2] Though very much smaller than the national library, it contains 250,000 volumes, and, in conformity with the liberal views of its founder, it is still kept open for the use of all who wish to read.

Little value was attached to the land which was still at a considerable distance from the new portion of the city. Noyers was granted the right to the land which is now the Rue Royale for three livres a year, and the Marquis of Mortemart received land that now constitutes one quarter of the Champs Elysées.[3]

The value of land is increased by the growth of population, and the prices at this time were naturally very low when compared with the amounts that have since been paid. A house in the Place Royale sold in 1630 for 13,000 livres, or about 5,000 dollars, while one near the Porte Saint Jacques was sold for only 3,000 livres.[4] Good shops rented for only a few hundred livres. Even the

[1] Sauval says it contained 45,000 volumes.

[2] Palais Mazarin, 20–3. Full descriptions of the palace and its contents are found in Sauval, ii., 173–177, and the Mazarinades. The library is especially described in "Muscurat."

[3] D'Estang, ii., 406–407. Plumatif, 2763.

[4] Mss. Godefroy, 131., 97, 167.

shops most patronized were, however, small and squalid. From 1640 to 1660, there was a considerable rise in the price of land, and especially at Paris. The property of Beaumont sur Oise sold in 1621 for 105,000 livres, and brought 155,000 in 1654.[1] This is, perhaps, a fair illustration; and a still larger increase would be found in the price of land in many parts of Paris. Richelieu paid 90,000 livres in 1624 for the Hotel Rambouillet, which furnished the site for the new palace of the cardinal.[2] The same property, in 1660, would have been considerably higher, but even then a residence large enough and elegant enough to be occupied by a family of rank, and situated in a fashionable quarter, could be bought for 150,000 livres, or 300,000 francs.[3]

Yet, on the prices paid for land, it yielded but a moderate return. Real estate producing 5,000 livres a year was thought very cheap at 100,000 livres.[4] When it was free from taxation, and conferred social rank, it was bought at figures that yielded a still smaller return. It is doubtful if the owners of "noble-land," so-called, received over 3 per cent. income on its value. But the price for money used in other ways was high. While the legal rate of interest was $6\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., the actual rate was considerably more. The government, if it could obtain honest and favorable dealing, could not borrow at less than 8 per cent., and that would also be the rate of business credits. Money on undoubted security was sometimes lent at 5 per cent., but the creditor often objected to so moderate a return.[5] The nobles, in 1626, asked that interest might be fixed by law at $6\frac{2}{3}$ per cent., which is evidence that they were then obliged to pay more than that on the loans they obtained.[6]

The city of Paris covered little more than one quarter of the territory which is now occupied by buildings, and its appearance was in every way very different. As late as

[1] *Ib.*, cxxxiii., 243. [2] Palais Mazarin, 4.

[3] This was the price of the house, near the Palais Mazarin, sold in 1660, and afterwards bought by Colbert for a less sum. [4] Voyage à Paris, 339.

[5] Journal d' Ormesson, 6. Lettres de Richelieu, v., 185. Anc. Lois françaises, xvi., 151, 406. [6] Assemblée des Notables, 150.

1627, building in the environs had been forbidden, but the growth of the city continued, both within and without the walls.[1] Richelieu embellished Paris in many ways and it was said in 1624, that never before in its history had so many and so great improvements been made as in the reign of Louis XIII.[2] The Luxembourg was begun in 1613 by Mary de Medici, and is one of the beautiful buildings for which France is indebted to that family. The States-General of 1614 were asked to allow the queen the sale of some offices, that she might use the proceeds in the construction of this palace. It was finished in 1620, and over thirty years later it was declared to be beyond question the most beautiful building in Paris.[3] There had been erected in the meantime, not only the palaces of the two cardinals, but a large number of handsome and expensive residences for many great nobles. As their life came to be spent more at Paris, they there erected their most costly and sumptuous dwellings. The most of those built at this time have been destroyed in the subsequent growth of the city.

In 1624 the construction was continued of the west part of the Louvre, and this work was carried on under Louis XIV. until the present east front was completed in 1665, but the most of the ground now covered by this great building was then occupied by streets and the residences of noblemen. A little beyond the Tuileries, where now is the Place de la Concorde, were the grounds of Renard extending along the Seine. He was the most celebrated caterer of the time, and his gardens were the favorite resort of the aristocracy. There were two long terraces from which one could watch the Cours la Reine and the open country beyond. Out-door parties were often given there, for which he provided the entertainment, and many of the political intrigues and quarrels of the day had Renard's for their scene of action. Beyond, by the banks

[1] Anc. Lois françaises, xvi., 214. [2] Mercure François, 772.

[3] Fontenay Mareuil, 71. États-Généraux, xvii., 43. Procès Verbal du Tiers. Voyage à Paris, 67.

of the Seine, was the Cours la Reine, which was the favorite drive. The Bois de Boulogne was little visited, and was chiefly known as the scene of robberies and duels. The Cours la Reine was laid out in 1616. Carriages had been but little used before that time, and there was no fashionable drive in Paris. People walked in the gardens for their recreation, but Mary de Medici introduced the usage which already prevailed in Florence, and turned the wheat fields which extended along the river into a drive, adorned by rows of trees. The most of the aristocracy followed closely on the king, and there were not enough carriages at Paris to make this a very animated scene when the Court was not present. One could visit there in the king's absence and find but few driving. As soon as he appeared the scene became exceedingly animated, and over two thousand carriages were often counted.[1] The ladies drove in open coaches, and many of the gentlemen were on horseback, and the drive furnished an opportunity for visiting and conversation.

Many of these carriages were drawn by six horses and were very elegant. They were often gilded or elaborately painted, luxuriously furnished, and they were attended by numerous lackeys. Glass, however, was not as yet used in them, and was still a costly and difficult article to obtain. The glass was sometimes taken out of the windows even of royal palaces, when they were left for the season, and a mirror two feet in size was regarded as very large. Public carriages began to come into use at this time. Cabs or carriages to let were used in 1650, and ordinary cabs in the streets in 1657. Many persons were carried in sedan chairs by porters, but the expense of this was considerable. To go about the city in a sedan chair or a carriage was stated to have cost at least twenty-two francs a day.[2] In 1662 the monopoly of cabs or omnibuses to run in the streets at regular hours was granted the Duke of Roannez and two other gentlemen. These were to have fixed courses, and could receive five

[1] Voyage à Paris en 1657, 104, 105. [2] Anc. Lois françaises, xviii., 16.

sous from each person.[1] When they were introduced into use they were followed by the hooting of the crowd, and occasionally by a volley of stones, but they gradually acquired some degree of favor.[2] The tariff for these cabs or omnibuses was soon raised to ten sous or twenty cents for a course, and in 1784 had reached thirty sous for cabs. At that price it still remains a century later. The distances were shorter then, but the roads were much worse, and the relative price for cabs is much cheaper than it was two centuries ago.

The streets of the city were usually in a very miserable condition. They had been irregularly laid out and almost all were very narrow. Sidewalks were unknown, many of the streets were not paved, and the roadways were generally very bad. The expense of constructing them and of keeping the streets clean was divided in various proportions between the state and the city of Paris,[3] but it was attended to by neither. The roadways that were built were of poor material, most of the city was low, the drainage was imperfect and floods were not unfrequent. An ordinance of 1637 appropriated 120,000 livres annually for cleaning the streets, to be collected from the residents. The tax was irregularly paid, and in bad weather the streets were in such condition that people could only walk with high boots. Even the judges in their robes were obliged to wear these unseemly articles. Richelieu complained that the main avenues were in such condition that the cost of teaming was doubled.[4] Notwithstanding the endeavors that were made, there were few streets in Paris that, in wet weather, could be traversed with comfort by men or with safety by carriages. For a carriage to tip over in the ruts or holes was a common occurrence. The mud and dirt became offensive in every way. Little sunlight reached the narrow streets, and the filth of the city was not removed. The mud stained

[1] *Ib.* [2] Sauval, i., 192.

[3] Anc. Lois fran. xvi., 478. Traité de la Police, iv., 218–225.

[4] Lettres, vi., 247.

the clothes of those who had to walk through it, and its stench was proverbial. It was not until Colbert that both the streets of the city and the roads through the country were put and kept in fair condition for travel. Mme. de Sévigné wrote that the infernal roads had now become heavenly highways; she only feared they were too broad and easy to lead to paradise.

The streets were not lighted. In a few places an occasional lamp was found, but these were lit by the bourgeois only to be extinguished by the thieves.[1] A gentleman was always accompanied by a lackey, who carried the light in front of him and explored the way. The bourgeois who braved the danger of the city at night took his lantern and his arms. Chains still closed many of the streets in the night-time, and the city appeared as if in a condition of semi-siege. There were no police, and there were innumerable robbers. Carriages were often attacked in the streets of Paris, and the occupants and their lackeys defended themselves with swords and fire-arms against their assailants. The robber would first endeavor to snatch the torch from the lackey, so that entire darkness should prevent any rescue.[2]

The unwary traveller was often asked by some one who affected the appearance of a stranger, to show the way to a tavern, where they could have a pipe of tobacco together, and, when some convenient place was reached, was attacked and overpowered. The bourgeois complained that Paris was full of robbers, there was risk in the transportation of merchandise, and they themselves were in apprehension even in their own houses. They kept guard, some of them declared, as if they were in a hostile country. The robbers were divided into those who snatched mantles by night, and those who attacked houses. Most of the former had been soldiers, or were valets discharged by their masters, and many of them found shelter in the houses of great nobles, who desired to have a large retinue of men-at-arms in case of need. The worst violence was in the winter, and the re-

[1] Palais Mazarin. [2] Scarron, 8 Epitre. Palais Mazarin, 228.

turn of the Court usually brought with it a body of lawless retainers, who got their dinner by hanging about the establishment of some unruly nobleman, and got money for drink by knocking some bourgeois over the head. The number of men who, by service in ill-disciplined armies, were rendered unfit to return to any peaceful avocation, furnished a great supply of thieves, brigands, and blacklegs.[1] Such disorders were sometimes diminished for a while, but during the civil wars there was less restraint than usual. In 1648 robbers attacked carriages in the streets at night with impunity.[2]

Somewhat better order was established after the close of the Fronde. Many of the brawls arose from the quarrels of lackeys, and these gentry were obliged to give up wearing swords. Begging in the streets was checked, and a vigorous endeavor was made to clear the town of the numerous gangs of robbers and cut-purses that infested it.[3]

Stones on which to dismount were placed in front of many doors, and formed obstructions in the streets, which were also encumbered by the little shops of bootmakers and fruit-dealers, and of women who patched clothes and darned stockings. Paris, under Mazarin, still retained much of the picturesque but inconvenient squalor of a mediæval city. These shops were swept away in 1666, amid many laments from their occupants.[4]

The bridges were centres for some kinds of small shops, and they were lined with them on either side. On the Pont Neuf there were fifty book-stalls, and there also desperadoes gathered in such numbers that they sometimes had miniature battles with the guards.[5] Such situations were not free from danger. Most of the bridges were of wood, and in the inundations of the Seine they were sometimes carried off. In 1596 a bridge had fallen and carried down all the houses and shops built upon it,

[1] A full account of these evils, and of the consultations of the authorities upon them, in 1634, is found in Talon, 30–34.

[2] Journal d' Ormesson, i., 405.

[3] Voyage à Paris, 214.

[4] Journal d' Ormesson, ii., 476.

[5] Lettres de Patin, i., 124. Aff. Étr. France, 892., 347.

with considerable loss of life. In 1637 another bridge was carried away, and in the inundation of 1658 the Pont Marie fell, taking down a great number of houses, and drowning sixty persons. The bridge was rebuilt, but permission was refused to build again at its sides, to the great regret of former proprietors. In 1621 two bridges were burned, and seven years later a third.[1] All these calamities caused great devastation to the unfortunate persons who had their houses or shops on them, but as they furnished cheap and convenient places, it was long before such buildings were entirely done away with.

The island had ceased to be the most important portion of Paris, and the Seine divided the territory occupied by the enlarged city. The right bank was known as the side of the Louvre, and the left as the side of the university. In the latter as many as sixty colleges were counted,[2] but by the seventeenth century the University of Paris had lost many of its privileges and much of the importance which it had once possessed. The students were forbidden to carry swords or pistols, and the gates of the colleges were ordered to be closed at five in the afternoon during the winter, and by nine during the summer. Students who were found wandering about the streets at later hours than this were to be imprisoned at once.[3] Few of the innumerable ordinances by which a paternal government regulated the detail of the customs and manners of its people were enforced, and these directions were probably disregarded, but the students do not figure in the accounts of violence and lawlessness at this period.

When persons were often attacked in the streets of Paris, the danger of a journey through the country was naturally very considerable. The traveller took his weapons and attendants, or went in parties, and felt justly grateful when the perils and discomforts of the journey were ended. A Venetian ambassador doubtless travelled

[1] Mercure François, vii., 857.
[2] Voyage à Paris, 39.
[3] Anc. Lois françaises, xvi., 426, Mch., 1635.

with as much comfort and safety as was possible, but he regarded the voyage from Venice to Paris as a serious and perilous undertaking, and in his despatches relates the great difficulties of the journey, together with his pleasure at having escaped them without serious injury.[1] When Mme. de Longueville went to Münster in 1647 her attendants travelled in anticipation of an attack, for though she had a large body of retainers, the bands of robbers were often numerous enough to assault a considerable party.[2]

There were many others who were not so fortunate as to escape attack. Pontis describes being waylaid by seven armed robbers, and his party exchanged shots with them for a quarter of an hour. Being themselves soldiers and well armed they at last repulsed the enemy.[3]

Molé writes complaining of the bands of robbers calling themselves bohemians, who rode over France with impunity. The authorities said that most of the highwaymen in the country had served as soldiers, and they were so well armed and mounted that it was very difficult to capture them by force.[4]

There were annoyances as well as dangers in travel. The inns about the country were usually poor and ill supplied, and fastidious travellers took their beds along with them.[5]

Much time was required for a journey. Three days were occupied in going from Paris to Rouen, and ten days to Lyons. Travellers using expedition and well provided with horses came from Calais to Paris in six days. The king took seven days in going from Metz to Versailles, but a special courier came from Rocroi in less than two days.[6] It took about twenty-one days to receive advices from Naples, and over two weeks for them to come

[1] Dis. Ven., cviii., 1, May, 1648. The same complaints were made by his predecessor, Nani. t. ci., June, 1644. [2] Voyage à Münster. Joly.

[3] Pontis, 462, 463. [4] Mém. de Molé, i., 398, 84. Talon, 33.

[5] Lettres de Mme. de Sévigné ii., 56. A century later Arthur Young complained of the beds in the taverns outside of Paris.

[6] Journal d'un Voyage à Paris, 18–28.

from Rome. A letter from London came ordinarily in seven days.[1]

Coaches for the use of the public went in some directions. They were usually monopolies, and the exclusive right to run them over a certain route was granted. Relays of horses were also established in various towns and cities, for the convenience of travellers.[2] The government began to take upon itself the care of the transportation of letters. Since Louis XI. special messengers on horseback had carried the despatches of the government regularly to different parts of France, and to foreign countries. The University of Paris enjoyed the privilege of sending messengers who could carry letters, money, and packages, or conduct passengers to various parts of the kingdom.[3] An ordinance of 1630 directed the royal messengers to take charge of the letters of individuals. This change was perhaps made in order to create the new offices, whose holders were to perform this duty and to receive the profits of the carriage. It was, however, a step towards the control of the posts by the government, and in 1662 the offices were abolished, and the state itself took charge of mails for individuals. Two couriers left Paris every week. The price fixed by law for sending a letter from Paris to Bordeaux or Lyons was three sous, or six cents. To London it was from eight to twenty sous, depending upon the weight. As much as fifteen sous was paid for sending a poem in manuscript from Paris to Amiens, and there were frequent complaints that more than the legal rates were charged for carrying letters.[4] The price which the coaches were allowed to charge a passenger from Paris to Rouen was about four livres, or eight francs; to Metz, twenty-four francs; to Lyons, thirty-eight francs.[5] These prices were high, but there was

[1] Brienne, 89.

[2] Ord., 1596. Anc. Lois, xv., 131.

[3] Anc. Lois, xvii., 48. These privileges are there recited. They had long been enjoyed by the universities.

[4] Règlement, Nov. 9, 1634. 22 May, 1636. Tallemant, ii., 196.

[5] Arrêt de Parlement, 26 July, 1623.

little travel. Persons could go by horseback at considerably less expense than by these coaches.[1]

Another important institution had its origin at this time. In 1626 an edict created the Jardin des Plantes for the purpose of raising herbs and medicinal plants for the benefit of all, and for the instruction of students at the University of Medicine.[2] This was placed under the care of Héruard, the first physician of the king, and after him many distinguished men held the position of superintendent. A century later Buffon held the office, and by his literary celebrity and the publication of his work on natural history, he gave a great impulse to the enlargement of the collections of animals. Like many other of the institutions which owed their origin to the judicious favor of Richelieu, this garden still continues to be of value and of interest to the public.

An ordinance of 1638 renewed the project of Sully for the construction of the canal of Briare to connect the Loire and the Seine. What had already been done was turned over to two men, who agreed to finish the canal in four years. They were to be made nobles for their services, and to have besides the perpetual right to the tolls to be charged on the boats.[3]

While such improvements were made in many directions, barbarous usages still prevailed. The shipwrecked were still received with cold hospitality, and the cargo of a vessel lost on the shores of France was often seized by the inhabitants, or by the governor of the province. The legal right to the property found in the wrecks belonged to the king, and Richelieu made some endeavors to check this sort of pillage and to preserve the rights of the owners.[4]

Torture was still used to obtain confession. This barbarous procedure was sometimes applied with great severity, though often the sight of the instruments induced the accused to confess whatever was desired.[5]

[1] Voyage à Paris, 18–28.
[2] Anc. Lois françaises, xvi., 161–4.
[3] *Ib.*, 488–497.
[4] Lettres de Richelieu, ii., 356, 361, *et passim.*
[5] Ormesson, i., 151.

The widow and two sons of a bookseller were found having in their possession some of the pamphlets against the government, circulated in the Fronde. The sons were tortured in order to discover who had written the burlesques, and afterwards strangled. As their mother was very old, and could neither read nor write, she was only fastened behind the cart and compelled to watch the punishment of her children.[1]

Criminals were sometimes broken at the wheel, and sometimes burned alive. It was often provided, however, in the sentence, that those condemned to be burned should first be strangled. Imprisonment for debt existed, but an edict of 1629 directed that women, and men over seventy, should not be confined for this cause.[2] There were many abuses in the prisons, from the cruelty of jailers and from the filthy condition in which they were kept.[3] Contagious diseases were so prevalent at the Chatelet in 1638, that persons confined for debt were released, and those held for crime were transferred to other prisons.[4]

Though the right to coin money was no longer possessed by any nobles, some of them found compensation in issuing counterfeit money. The Count of Angoulême confessed that he received twelve thousand livres a year for renting one chamber in his castle to Merlin, a well-known counterfeiter.[5] Richelieu complained that the abuse of coining counterfeit money was practised or protected among persons of quality to such an extent, that it added to the financial confusion of the kingdom; and as late as 1664 some nobles were complained of as being notorious counterfeiters.[6]

Sunday was not observed with the strictness of Protestant countries, and Richelieu lamented that while Gustavus Adolphus refused to attend to negotiations for a treaty on that day, the French were always willing to devote it to secular matters and thus expel the holy thoughts

[1] *Ib.*, 747. [2] Anc. Lois françaises, xvi., 269.
[3] Rapport sur Touraine, 77. [4] Molé, ii., 413. [5] Tallemant, i., 220.
[6] Mém. de Richelieu, xxii.. 334. Rapport sur Touraine.

which should occupy them.[1] The close connection of the church and state allowed the latter to regulate the fees of the clergy. The ordinance of 1644 allowed ten sous for saying high mass for the dead, and eight sous for low mass. Each of the priests attending the funeral was allowed five sous, and the curé twenty sous. The price for asking the prayers of the congregation for one who had left nothing to the curé was thirty sous. Thirty sous was allowed for publishing the banns, and the same sum, or sixty cents in our money, for celebrating a wedding.[2]

Marriage was legalized solely by the religious ceremony, and abuses and fraudulent marriages were not uncommon. The ordinance required the consent of parents for men until thirty, and for women until twenty-five, declared promises of marriage void unless they were in writing, and required the publication of banns, and public marriages in the church.[3] Marriages were largely arranged by the parents upon family and money considerations, and elopements or abductions by violence were more frequent than they are now. The form of a marriage ceremony with girls of high rank was sometimes performed when they were only twelve, and at that age, if accompanied by the consent of the parents, it was a valid alliance. A system, where the desires of the parties themselves were often so little consulted, may have been one of the causes for the exceedingly free life of most of the heroines of the Fronde, and for the large number of illegitimate children who appeared in many noble families. The business-like nature of marriage contracts was recognized, and it excited no comment. Ormesson speaks of the superintendent Bailleul's being occupied in arranging a marriage for his son with a gentleman's daughter then nine years old, upon the condition that she should have six hundred thousand livres in money and two hundred thousand in other articles, and with a forfeiture of two hundred thousand to the superintendent if the marriage was not solemnized.[4]

[1] Mém de Richelieu, xxii., 302. [2] Anc. Lois françaises, xvii., 28, 39.
[3] *Ib.*, xvi., 520–524. [4] Journal d'Ormesson, 197.

Such alliances resulted not only in many separations, but in many divorces. Divorces in form could not be obtained, because the church did not allow them, but the same result was reached on very slight grounds, by a declaration that the marriage was itself invalid and void. Relationship within the remote bounds prohibited by the canon law was used as a pretext, and so also was the fact that the marriage had been obtained by violence and without consent. When both parties were wearied of it this was often easily proved, and frequently without the necessity for much perjury. Even being without children was sometimes urged as a ground upon which the nullity of the marriage could be adjudicated.[1] By a practice, that has since been abandoned, ladies, though assuming their husband's name in society, continued to sign their maiden names.

Many superstitions were still entertained which have long since been abandoned. The royal touch was believed to be efficacious in driving away the king's evil. Experiments were made in alchemy before Louis XIII. and his ministers by some charlatan, who, it was claimed, could make gold.[2] Richelieu stated in his memoirs that Luines had dealings with two renowned magicians, and he seems to have believed that herbs were put in the king's shoes to obtain an influence over him. Those who are filled with ambition often commit such impieties, the cardinal remarks.[3] One Saint Isidore, of Spain, had performed great miracles in fecundity, and it was deemed advisable to send to him some sacred relics that he might exert himself on behalf of Anne of Austria. Richelieu, however, had some doubts as to the probable success of the efforts of the holy man.[4] The queen herself was very superstitious, and was alarmed by any incident of evil omen.

Retz relates being one evening with the Marshal of Turenne and some ladies, when the driver declared that

[1] Let. de Richelieu, ii., 175. Tallemant, vii., 244. [2] Let. v., 625.

[3] Mém. de Richelieu, ed Michaud, xxi., 249.

[4] Lettres de Richelieu, vii., 767, June 20, 1637.

he saw devils just in front. The ladies were greatly terrified. The Bishop of Lisieux was with the party, and he told them not to be terrified because they were in the hand of the Lord. Turenne and Retz summoned up courage enough to proceed against the enemy, and they were found to be monks. Brion, a gentleman with them, was almost overcome by terror, and even Turenne confessed that he believed the apparitions might well be devils, and he proceeded against them as a soldier who recognizes the peril. Retz claims to have been the least terrified, which, as he was free from any religious belief, is very possible.[1]

Patin speaks of the common belief at Paris, that a child born in the new moon would probably encounter great perils in life.[2] He speaks of this superstition only to ridicule it, but Patin was a man of unusual ability and learning, and belonged to a profession whose studies are apt to make them incredulous as to the beliefs held by many others. Many persons of intelligence and prominence still consulted horoscopes. The Duke of Guise had his astrologer, and so did a much greater man, the Duke of Wallenstein. Such superstitions were by no means universal, but they had not yet become ridiculous.

The credulity of the age manifested itself in more gloomy shapes than these. In 1619 Vanini, a celebrated philosopher, was condemned for atheism by the Parliament of Toulouse. His tongue was cut out for having pronounced impious words, and he was then burned alive.[3] In 1639 a man was executed for blasphemy, and the Parliament was earnest in its demand that death should continue to be the penalty prescribed by law for this offence.[4] But the numerous prosecutions for magic attracted much more attention. Urbain Grandier was a curé at Loudun, of much ability, but of questionable morals, and he had been director of a convent of the

[1] Mém. de Retz, i.. 69–73.
[2] Lettres de Patin, i., 160.
[3] Anciennes Lois françaises, xvi., 135. Mercure françois, v., 63.
[4] *Gazette* for 1639, p. 40.

Ursulines there. One of the inmates declared that a former director, and also Grandier, appeared to her in visions, and advised her to immoral courses. The whole convent was soon disturbed by similar visions and by the solicitations of the enemy. The monotonous life of a body of ignorant women, shut off from the world, made it easy for such delusions to spread among them. They were believed by those of greater intelligence. The superior at Loudun wrote Bouthillier that rebellion and silence were only too common among these devils, and much patience was needed to discover their malice. But he had exorcised them, and they had confessed, after great resistance, that simply from malice they had caused some disturbances in Bouthillier's mind, but their charms had not had the success they desired. Even the Sorbonne admitted that there were cases of real possession by the devil. Grandier was tried for having introduced the evil one into the convent; he was convicted on the depositions of Astaroth, Asmodeus, and Zabulon, was tortured and burned alive.[1] His friends complained in vain that too much credence was given to the testimony of the emissaries of the father of lies.

Such follies excited imitation. A half-crazy nun, named Madeleine Bavent, at the monastery of Louviers, accused Picard, a deceased director, of having exorcised her. There is little doubt that he was an immoral man, and he had possibly obtained an influence over this weak woman by pretending to practise magical rites. The convent was soon disturbed by many of the nuns who claimed to be possessed by the evil one, and the matter was brought before the courts. The mark of the sorcerer was recognized on various of the inmates of this and other convents. Contortions, wrestlings with the evil one, and possessions by the fiend now became frequent in various monasteries. Madeleine Bavent was condemned to imprisonment as a sorcerer. A solicitor had been

[1] Anciennes Lois, xvi., 413. Histoire des Diables de Loudun. Mercure, xx., 771, *et seq.* for 1634. Archives Curieuses, 2 series, t., v., 183–283. Lettres de Richelieu, v., 16.

appointed to represent the corpse of Picard, and this was also condemned. It had been dug from the grave over four years ago, and carried from place to place during its trial before the Parliament of Normandy. It was now dragged on a hurdle to a public place at Rouen, and burned before a great multitude. But at the same time, on August 21, 1647, a priest named Boullé, who had been Picard's vicar, was burned alive. He had been tried before the Parliament on the accusation of various persons who were possessed by the evil one. Bavent testified that she had seen him adore the demon at unholy assemblies she had attended, and that she was present when Leviathan put his mark upon him. Two physicians declared that they discovered the mark of the sorcerer upon the unfortunate priest, and he was condemned and executed for magic, sacrilege, and other impieties committed against the divine majesty.[1]

This gloomy nonsense found little credence at Paris. The Parliament decided in 1660 that it had no jurisdiction over charges of magic, and that it would not entertain accusations for such an offence.[2] But the Parliament of Normandy continued for many years zealous in its work, and it was only after much resistance that later in the reign of Louis XIV. these prosecutions were stopped by the government.

When such superstitious beliefs could find any credence, it was natural that there should be laws against the Jews. Frequent edicts forbidding their residence in France are found among the ordinances of the earlier French kings, but they had long been tolerated, and a considerable number of them came to France during the favor of the Marshal of Ancre. Their removal was asked in the cahiers of the

[1] See Histoire de Magdelaine Bavent, 1652. Registres de Tournelle de Rouen, 1647. Traité des marques des possedéz, et les Preuves de la veritable possession des religieuses de Louviers, par Pierre Magnart docteur en médecine, 1644. Recit véritable de ce qui s'est fait aux exorcismes de plusieurs religieuses de Louviers, 1643. Histoire du Parlement de Normandie, v., 634, *et seq.*

[2] Let. de Patin, ii., 46.

clergy at the States-General of 1614, and this request was promptly granted. An edict of 1615 declared that the presence of Jews in the kingdom was abhorrent to the piety of a most Christian king, and ordered them to leave within one month, under pain of death and the confiscation of their goods.[1] So barbarous a law could not, however, be enforced. Some left and went to Holland, some bought toleration, some remained and were unmolested. In 1657 they are spoken of as being at Paris, but they did not occupy a position of commercial importance.[2] It was not until the Revolution that they obtained legal protection.

Yet, though there was much bigotry and superstition, it was said that sceptical views were found among many.[3] Avowed scepticism was, however, rare, and while many had perhaps ceased to have an actual belief in Christianity, they had not ceased to profess it. Their superstitions in like manner were entertained without being believed. Bussy Rabutin said he was afraid of spirits, without believing in them. This gallant officer was not ashamed to confess that, sleeping in a lonely room, he hid his head under the bedclothes, lest he should hear some sound that he would believe proceeded from ghosts.[4]

An extended review of French literature during the administrations of Richelieu and Mazarin would occupy an undue space in a general history. But this period was one which contained the flower, if not the fruit, of the golden age of the literature of France. The age of Louis XIV. is illustrious from the great writers who flourished in it; but in this as in other things, while Louis' influence was not without its effect, he has been fortunate in receiving the glory to which he had no exclusive claim.

Literature was encouraged by Richelieu and patronized by Louis XIV. It fared perhaps even better at the hands of Anne of Austria and Mazarin, for they let it alone.

[1] Anc. Lois françaises, xvi., 76–8. Mém. de Richelieu, xxi., 98.
[2] Voyage à Paris, 81.
[3] Mém. de Mme. de Motteville, 204.
[4] Mém. de Bussy Rabutin, i., 76.

But the stirring and important events of the fifty years which followed the death of Henry IV. were better for the development of great writers, than was the favor of ministers or princes. Richelieu certainly did something for the literature of his land in the attention he gave to men of letters. If his taste was not always pure, or his patronage always judicious, he often rendered help or encouragement where it was needed and deserved. But he gave more impulse by his career than by his bounty. The great part which France played in Europe, the cardinal's broad plans and his lofty ambition, the vigor and even the severity of his rule, were the education for a great literature.

Nor were the years that followed less instructive for the observers of manners and men. The license and turbulence of the Fronde, its tragedy and comedy, and shifting phases, the unbridled abuse and vituperation which prevailed, the bourgeoisie, loyal to-day and rebellious to-morrow, the nobles, Frondeurs on one day and Mazarinites on the next,—all these things enabled the dramatist, the comedian, and the satirist to observe the strength and the weakness of human nature. The society of this period possessed freshness and *esprit*. The bourgeois watched the conduct of his rulers and was not afraid to discuss it. The members of the Parliaments were not only lawyers, but men of affairs. The nobles were often turbulent and independent, with a boldness of wit and thought that was refined and polished out of existence in those who spent their lives at Versailles, paying well-turned compliments to Louis XIV.

Such was the life amid which most of the great French writers of the seventeenth century received their training. Corneille's best tragedies and the great works of Descartes were produced under Richelieu. Molière was travelling through the provinces of France during twelve years of Mazarin's administration, seeing the types of human nature which he was to immortalize. The works of Retz and Rochefoucauld belong to the literature of the Fronde.

When Mazarin died Molière was a man of almost forty, and his reputation as a dramatist was established; Pascal had finished his writings, Racine was past twenty-one, La Fontaine was well known, and Boileau was beginning to be known; Bossuet had been preaching at Paris for several years. Bossuet belongs, however, more to the latter part of the century, and his sonorous eloquence bears an intellectual resemblance to the character of the reign of Louis XIV.

Some influence upon French literature in the early part of the century should be attributed to the Hotel Rambouillet. It was one of the centres of fashionable life, and one of the first of the famous French salons, open alike to the aristocracy of birth and of genius, which have encouraged letters and added brilliancy to society. There princes and marshals met on equal terms with the writers of plays and the inditers of sonnets. At the Hotel Rambouillet Corneille read his tragedies, Balzac talked of Greece and Rome, Voiture wrote fluent and amusing verses, and made love with a freedom which sometimes verged on impertinence. There Mlle. de Scudery observed the characters which she afterwards described at infinite length in the Grand Cyrus.

But while at the Hotel Rambouillet, the roughnesses which still appeared in social life were softened, nobles learned something about letters, and writers learned something about manners, its beneficial effect on literature has been somewhat exaggerated. Great men were sometimes found there, but no great work can be regarded as the product of the salon of Mme. de Rambouillet. Its influence, and that of the other salons which imitated and perhaps exaggerated its tone, tended rather, after a time, to an undue grammatical nicety; to a jargon of fine words with little wit; to an affectation of feelings and passions sublimated and super-refined; to make men write stilted poetry, and ladies talk nonsense about the love of the soul. The Scudery, with their wearisome romances, and the *précieuses*, ridiculed by Molière and Boileau, derived

much of their intellectual nutriment from the Hotel Rambouillet.

The subsequent characteristics of French literature, its regularity in form, its clearness of style, its observance of rule, its avoidance of excess—qualities which, though sometimes exaggerated, have done much to make it the most cosmopolitan of literatures,—were formed during the seventeenth century. In the beginning of it, Malherbe carried on his campaign against the bad taste, the pedantry, the imitation of the Italian, which he found among the poets formed in the sixteenth century. His criticisms were as vigorous as Dr. Johnson's conversation. "This is without judgment," he writes of one phrase; "that piece is so weak and school-boy like, that it deserves no criticism; that phrase may be Latin, but it is not French; and the other was stolen from the Italian, where it was almost as bad as when it is put in French."

Malherbe, Boileau wrote, first compelled the muse to the rules of duty. The French muse has sometimes suffered, because the rules have become fetters. A Pegasus, less restrained, not harnessed to the plough which kept it in the furrow of rectitude, might perhaps have taken higher flights. But Malherbe did much by precept, and somewhat by example, towards improving poetry which had neither taste nor vigor.

One who would both improve and adorn literature was thought to have been found in Balzac, who, by his letters, when a very young man, burst into a blaze of glory. Seneca was declared monotonous beside him; his books were almost as widely known as fire and water; they were the philter which made the French tongue dear to nations who dwelt on the shores of the Arctic seas. The fame that was so great grew faint even in Balzac's lifetime, and it has faded away in two centuries. He has had the accidental misfortune, that one of the great authors of this century has borne the same name, and even this has to many readers still further obscured the writer, whose letters, it was once said, made the sick forget their maladies. It has been

discovered that among his magnificent words and sonorous sentences there was very little thought to be found. Yet Balzac really exerted an influence on the literature of the day that was not only considerable, but usually beneficial. If sometimes he had only words to give the public, they were very good words. He cultivated a dignified style; he avoided faults of expression; he improved the prose composition of the day.

Voiture was a versifier of some merit, though he also enjoyed a reputation with contemporaries, which has not been confirmed by posterity. But he possessed skill in a branch of literature for which the French language is well adapted, and in which much has since been written that possesses the considerable merit of furnishing amusement. Voiture wrote facile verses about ladies and wits, the poetry of badinage and good society. He praised the beauties of the time, in language which loses force from its excessive sweetness. M. Voiture, said one of the ladies whose charms he described, ought to be preserved in sugar. Such, perhaps, would be an appropriate fate for his poetry. But, save in the drama, little poetry of any permanent merit appeared during the first half of the century. Bad taste, combined with literary trifling and a foolish daintiness about words, were the characteristics of most of the poets whom Boileau attacked a few years later. The French Academy had been created, but its energies were largely employed in beginning the dictionary which it took two centuries to finish, and it increased the taste for minute verbal niceties. Cabals were formed to have some word received in the dictionary, or excluded from it. Purism is not often a sign of vigor, and it was not then.

It was among a community which was interested in such controversies, that Mlle. de Scudery found readers for her interminable romances. The popularity which they enjoyed in her own day was very great and was not confined to France. Pepys tells us: "I fell a-reading Fuller's History of Abbeys, and my wife in Great Cyrus till twelve at

night," and again, "I find my wife troubled at my checking her last night in a coach, in her long stories out of Grand Cyrus." Long the stories certainly were, but they were not thought too long by a generation that had few novels to read.

Mlle. de Scudery had her own romance with Pellisson, who was among the minor writers of the day. Some of her letters to him have been published, and they are naturally and pleasantly expressed. It shows the power of affection, that when Mlle. de Scudery wrote love-letters, she forgot to be prolix and ceased to be wearisome.

Though the refinements of language were carried to excess, this was part of the process by which French literature was trained to the orderly and well-pruned forms which seem congenial to its character. The rules which Boileau laid down, and which he illustrated in his practice, became part of the code of French poetry, which was unquestioned until this century, and whose authority, though it has been modified, has not been abrogated.

A strong influence towards developing a literature that was masculine in tone, clear in meaning, and free from affectation, came from the Port Royal. In his Provincial Letters, Pascal reached a style on which two centuries have been unable to make any improvement. They had the wit that comes from an ingenious but not an affected mode of composition, and showed the qualities of the best French prose, delicacy of expression, combined with perfect clearness of meaning. Pascal wrote a little volume of meditations, and he is recognized as one of the great thinkers of the world; he published a few letters, and they represent the perfection of style in French literature.

But though the other disciples of the Port Royal reached no such eminence, they did much for French prose. Their writings were as vigorous as their belief. They were adorned by few flowers of rhetoric, and they were defaced by no obscurities of expression.

The tendency to clearness and good taste, which was developed in literature, had its effect on the oratory of the

pulpit and the bar, though the improvement did not become marked until somewhat later. The oratory of the first half of the seventeenth century, so far as it has been preserved, seems ordinarily to have been turgid and wearisome. The speeches were very long and equally dull. An undigested mass of pedantry was inflicted upon the unhappy listener. The history of antiquity and the courses of the heavenly bodies were ransacked for illustrations to adorn the harangues of the members of Parliament, and the dissertations of divines. In the eloquence of the pulpit, Bossuet was among the first who reached a standard which would now be regarded as high, but his influence was mostly felt in the latter part of the century. Improvement in forensic speaking came still later. There was no political oratory. The government of France afforded no opportunity for the exercise of this kind of public speaking.

The period furnished to the history of metaphysics one of its great names. Descartes' Discourse on Method was published in 1637, and his other important works followed. He had left France in order to prepare them. The subtle and dangerous air of Paris, he said, inclined the brain toward vanity and made one produce only chimeras. In the tranquil cloud and fog of Holland he found an atmosphere which he preferred for the development of his thoughts. Notwithstanding Descartes' genius, and the discoveries with which his name is to some extent identified, his treatises, like those of most metaphysicians, have left mankind little nearer any solution of the mysteries of existence. But he justly ranks among the great French writers. Preceding Pascal in time, he was not far his inferior in command of the language in which he wrote.

But it was the drama in which this period shows the most extraordinary progress. The productions of Corneille and Molière seem the more remarkable, because there existed no prior French dramas of any value, and because they were not surrounded by such a school of dramatic writers as was found in England during the age

of Shakespeare. Corneille, indeed, took the inspiration, as he did the subject of the Cid from the Spanish drama. He has improved on his models, but the tone of the Cid is Spanish. The pride and the punctilios of honor which are described together with a love that is also Castilian in its character seemed peculiarly fitted for French taste in the time of Richelieu, and the Cid had a prodigious success. It has still kept its place on the French stage, but later in his life Corneille was less fortunate in the influences by which his plays were affected. To a few great plays he added many whose merit does not entitle them to a high position in French literature.

None of Corneille's works appeal, like Molière's plays, to the feelings which are common to all the world. But Molière in his creations was still more without literary models. He saw the world, as Shakespeare did, during his life as an actor. The humanity which he observed furnished his inspiration, and his practical experience on the stage assisted in teaching the forms under which character must be portrayed to adapt it for public representation. He acted in the plays he wrote, and the characters were to some extent chosen so as to afford suitable rôles for the members of his troupe. Before Mazarin's death Molière had produced "L'Etourdi," "Dépit Amoureux," "Les Précieuses Ridicules," and "Sganarelle." The troupe had acted with success before the king, the cardinal, and the Prince of Conti, and it had gained the favor of the theatre-goers of Paris. During his remaining years, Molière had but to continue his delineations of the different characters, which he had watched as closely as Shakespeare, and which he portrayed as faithfully. It was the comic side of life that attracted his attention. His were the first comedies of high merit in French literature, and they still remain the best.

In another department, also, the art of pleasing was brought to its perfection. The most of Mme. de Sévigné's letters to her daughter were written later, but her earlier ones are the equal of any, and have the characteristics of

all. A writer much less known is no unworthy member of the same school. Guy Patin said that he put neither Phœbus nor Balzac in his letters. He put in them, however, a terse and racy French which makes one regret that he did not write more about politics and less about medicine.

Memoir writing seems to have been the weakness of those of noble blood. Many who were prominent at the time have left their memoirs to instruct posterity about the events of the period, and the achievements of the writers. The least trustworthy and by far the best written are those of Cardinal Retz. The cardinal sought to deceive posterity about his own rôle, in which he has largely failed, and to show his skill in describing the characters and events of a troubled period, in which he has been singularly successful. In the literary qualities of his memoirs he has surpassed his enemy, Rochefoucauld. But Rochefoucauld revenged himself for the disappointments he had met from the world by dissecting, in maxims that have become part of its literature, what is selfish and despicable in human nature.

CHAPTER XX.

THE PORT ROYAL.

THE reigns of Louis XIII. and XIV. are among the great eras of the Gallican Church, but it was from the impulse given early in the century that so much was accomplished during its course. At the beginning of the seventeenth century the condition of the Church was by no means edifying. The fierce agitation of the League and the wars of religion had been succeeded by apathy in some quarters, and immorality in others. Content with the triumph of the Church, many forgot to practise its precepts. There was an abundant supply of those whose lives were nominally devoted to the service of religion. It was estimated that there were in France over 100,000 of the secular clergy, 87,000 monks, and 80,000 nuns. But not all of this great body were animated by Christian zeal, or devoted to a Christian life. Among many of them, it was declared, there could be found neither charity, nor intelligence, nor good morals. It would have seemed probable that the scepticism of the renaissance, which had found utterance in France during the sixteenth century, would have proceeded with its work, and that we should at once have found the age of Voltaire and the Encyclopedists. But such was not the case. The seventeenth century in France was an age of faith. The influence of the Church increased. The zeal of the faithful became greater. The desire for a devotional life has rarely been more widespread.

The establishment of various institutions had a great effect in increasing, both the ability, and the zeal of the French clergy. In 1611 the Oratory was founded, and

its members did important work in cultivating the intelligence, and purifying the morals of the clergy. Seminaries for the education of the priests were either founded or remodelled, and that of Saint Sulpice is only one among many of such institutions, whose influence has helped to establish the high standard of the Gallican Church.

Such steps were accompanied by the display of great zeal in works of charity. The chief glory of this beneficence belongs to Saint Vincent de Paul. Vincent de Paul earned his canonization, not by apocryphal miracles, but by devoting sixty years of untiring labor to the aid of the poor, the relief of the distressed, the care of the sick, the succor of every form of misery. No other man in the century did so much to lessen the burden of human woe. He accomplished great results, because he not only himself worked in the cause, but inspired others to follow his example. He organized brotherhoods of charity, and associations both of men and women, for various good works. In 1625 he formed the congregation of the Priests of the Mission, who were specially intended for missionary and charitable work in the country.

During the long years of war the priests and followers of Saint Vincent were found in Lorraine, in Picardy, in Champagne, wherever the need was greatest, extending charity on a colossal scale to relieve the enormous misery of the times.[1]

This zeal in religious and charitable work was attended also by a large growth in the number of the monasteries, and of their inmates. So many new monasteries were founded, that Richelieu at last endeavored to check an increase which he thought immoderate. Other causes than religious zeal accounted to some extent for the great numbers who retired from the world. In the families of nobles or those of prominent position, daughters for whom there seemed no opening in the world were often destined to

[1] The reports of the Priests of the Mission are often the best authority for the condition of the people, to whose needs they ministered.

become religious recluses, without considering whether they had a calling for such a life. Indeed, they were often put in convents when young children, and before even their parents could have any knowledge of their dispositions. For the younger sons of good families the Church also furnished a livelihood. In times of war, the public distress brought some to seek refuge from the world. But to such causes must be added a religious spirit extending through all classes, which led many to leave the world and seek to pass their lives in pious solitude.

The conditions which influenced the secular clergy in the early part of the century, had also affected the monasteries. In many of them there was indifference, and in some of them there was immorality. But reforms were effected which often worked an entire change in their religious character, and in the conduct of their inmates. La Trappe became especially known for the severity of its discipline.

But the Port Royal was the scene of the phases of devotional life of most interest to posterity. It was made illustrious by the piety and devotion of the members of the monastery, and by the remarkable men who there lived in solitary retirement, and who became identified with its history. The names of the Arnaulds and the Pascals, of Andilly and Tillemont are suggested by the place which was their chosen home, or their dearest refuge. Racine and Mme. de Longueville there found retreat or inspiration.[1]

The monastery of Port Royal in the Fields was in a narrow valley about eighteen miles from Paris. The

[1] The literature on the subject of the Port Royal and the Jansenist controversy is very copious. By far the best account of the Port Royal is its history by Sainte Beuve, which is one of the most perfect histories in literature. Sainte Beuve was far removed from the beliefs of Saint Cyran and the Arnaulds, but, with the capacity for appreciating different modes of thought, which was the characteristic of his genius, he has described the history and doctrines of the Port Royal with such fulness and accuracy that little remains for others but to follow his views.

situation was a gloomy one, near an unwholesome swamp, and seemingly cut off from any view of the world. Such were the places ordinarily chosen by those of the order of Saint Bernard, to which this abbey belonged. St. Bruno, it was said, chose the woods, and St. Benedict the hills, but St. Bernard established his monasteries in valleys, that the inmates might lose the view of the world and keep only that of Heaven.

Port Royal was an ancient foundation, claiming to owe its origin to Mathilde de Garlande, in 1204. Its long history is obscure, and at the beginning of the seventeenth century its spiritual condition was the same as that of most convents at that time. The inmates visited in the neighborhood and received visits. They wore masks and dressed in the fashion of the time. Religious services were attended with moderate regularity, but the confessor was a Bernardin so ignorant that he did not understand the Pater, did not know a word of the catechism, and never opened any book but his breviary. For more than thirty years there had been no preaching there, except at the professions of a few of the nuns.

In pleasant weather its inmates played games and walked in the court. On wet days they read romances. There were no scandalous improprieties, but neither was there any intense religious zeal. Of this monastery Jacqueline Arnauld, a member of a prominent parliamentary family and the daughter of a distinguished lawyer, became the abbess at the age of ten. Such things were frequent when family influence was sufficiently strong, and the young Jacqueline spent her early years after the fashion of her associates. But the light soon shone upon her spiritual darkness. While listening to a sermon "God touched me," she writes, "so from that moment I was more happy than I had formerly thought myself miserable, in being a *religieuse*." This first awakening was followed by violent struggles for some months, but at last grace triumphed. Mother Angelique, to use her religious name, was about seventeen when she

began her work of reformation. She found the sisters ready to join with her. All put their property into a common fund. A more decided step was to close the abbey to outsiders, and even to the families of the sisters. Mother Angelique soon put this reform into execution. Her father visited her, but she refused to talk with him except through a wicket, or to admit him into what were called the "*lieux réguliers.*" M. Arnauld stormed at this sudden resistance of his daughter, and sought to force an entrance. His wife and children called Mother Angelique an ingrate and a monster. In the intensity of her feeling she fainted, but the contest was won, and the family at last yielded to her views. The day of the wicket, as this was called, the 25th of September, 1609, may be regarded as the public beginning of the rigorous and intense religious life of the Port Royal.

Various names are associated with the history of the place, as it grew from a monastery known for a piety which recalled the early days of Christianity, until it became finally the object of a fierce persecution, when it was identified with the cause of Jansenism. In the early days, when Mother Angelique and her religious household were in the joyful freshness of a newly kindled faith and zeal, we find them in relations with Francis of Sales, Bishop of Geneva, who was in due time added to the saints of the Catholic Church. He was a strong contrast to the stern St. Cyran, who was later to exert so great an influence over the Port Royal. Filled with a fervent piety, Francis of Sales grasped the poetical phases of religion. The stern mysteries of life which appalled Pascal were not perceived by him. He felt but a gospel of love to be practised in a world of beauty. His writings are filled with metaphors and in their tender perception of nature sometimes remind one of St. Francis of Assisi. When he saw a beautiful valley he said: "These places are agreeable and fertile and the waters flow to them. Thus the waters of celestial Grace flow into humble souls, and leave dry the tops of the mountains." And at the sight of a

fountain he cried: "When shall we have in our hearts the fountains of living waters; when shall we drink freely at the fountain of our Lord?" And of the rivers he said: "When shall we go to God, as the waters to the sea?" Such a man found in the fresh piety of the young Mother Angelique a strong delight. His character and teachings fitted him peculiarly for influence over women, and Saint Francis had many who looked to him as their constant adviser. Their influence tended, perhaps, to increase the natural soft exuberance of his religion, until it lacked something of the spirit which is needed in a world that cannot always be overcome by metaphors and pleasant words. Says Nicole, the disciple of Port Royal, speaking of priests and confessors: "There is a spiritual gallantry as well as a sensual, and if one does not keep guard, intercourse with women ordinarily ends in this." The somewhat masculine religion of the sisters of the Port Royal found in Saint Cyran and Arnauld more congenial teachers.

In the meantime the monastery largely increased in numbers. Mother Angelique's piety and administrative ability had attracted such attention that in 1618 she was removed to the Abbey of Maubuisson, where a reform was sadly needed. Henry IV. had made abbess a sister of Gabrielle D'Estreés, a woman whose morals were those of Gabrielle, unredeemed by her grace. Her scandalous life became unbearable, and Louis XIII. ordered her to be removed. She refused to obey, and had to be violently carried away by the officers. The difficult task was left of reforming the morals that had been formed under her tuition. Mother Angelique found the sisters so ignorant of all Christian duties that they did not even know how to confess. They had devised three forms of confession: one to be used on great festivals, one on Sundays, and one on other days. These they had written in a book, and they were used by all the sisters. But even over such natures the new abbess gained an influence, and she slowly and cautiously changed the forms and the spirit of the

monastery. To assist in leavening the body, she introduced some thirty new sisters, mostly poor, whom she more easily formed to a religious life. After some time the Mother was relieved of her duties there, and returned to the Port Royal. But the nuns of Maubuisson complained that she had filled their house with poor girls, who brought nothing with which to defray their expenses. She appealed to the members of the Port Royal, and, although already poor, they joyfully agreed that the thirty should share and increase their poverty. The recruits were received by the sisters singing a Te Deum over this new victory of the faith. The numbers at the Port Royal had increased to eighty, and the situation was so unhealthy that there were many deaths. In 1626 they moved to Paris, and the abbey in the fields remained for many years deserted.

M. Zamet, a pious but not a great man, for a while had the spiritual charge of the Port Royal, but in 1634 the abbé of St. Cyran became its director. To his influence is due the position it took in the coming conflict of Jansenism, and the effects of his teachings can be seen in the sisters, and in most of the illustrious recluses who attached themselves to the monastery.

St. Cyran had been an early associate of Jansenius, whose writings became such a fire-brand in the Church. As young men they devoted the most of five years to an intense study of St. Augustine. It is said Jansenius read all of his works ten times, and thirty times his treatises against the Pelagians. The two students resolved to attempt a reformation in the belief of the Church, which they thought was falling away from many of the tenets of the father. Jansenius was presently made bishop of Ypres by the Spanish as a reward for a political tract, but he pursued his studies in his new bishopric. The abbé of St. Cyran became a prolific theological writer. He was a stern, dogmatic, unwavering man, caring nothing for temporal honors, and holding narrowly and intensely to what he believed to be the truth. He was

an ardent student, independent in thought and conduct, one who loved to dwell on the rigorous tenets of St. Augustine, and made no compromise with a lax faith or an easy piety. Though stern in his belief, St. Cyran taught a practical and subdued Christianity, which was sometimes a little exceeded when in later years the sisters of the Port Royal came to regard themselves as confessors of the faith, and seemed almost to court martyrdom.

"Avoid exaggeration," said he. "There is more humility in confessing simply." "You will engage in religious work during Lent," he writes to Sister Marie Claire, another of the Arnaulds, "but without excess, that you may persevere. It is contrary to humility to wish to do extraordinary things. We are not saints, that we may do the deeds of saints. We must keep humbly to our mediocrity." For the sometimes excessive zeal of the sisters of the Port Royal a better director than St. Cyran could not have been found.

But his relations were soon interrupted by the suspicious tyranny of Richelieu. It is difficult to say what excited the cardinal's animosity, unless it was the independence and vigor of St. Cyran's character. He had refused the minister's favors, and as he would not be a follower he was held to be an enemy. Upon a ground that does not deserve to be called even a pretext, the abbé of St. Cyran was confined in the Bastille in 1638, and he was not released until after Richelieu's death. He pursued his studies there with a calmness not to be disturbed by imprisonment.

In 1641 the comedy of "Mirame" was performed with great splendor at the cardinal's palace, and it was witnessed by various courtly bishops. John de Wert, the brilliant captain, then a prisoner of war, was brought to see the play, and was asked how he liked it. "It was very beautiful," he replied, "but what surprises me most is that, in this very Christian kingdom, I see the bishops at the comedy, while the saints are in prison."

In the meantime, the long labors of Jansenius had

brought forth their fruit. In 1640, the Augustinus appeared, in which the bishop of Ypres sought, by a full reproduction of the doctrines of St. Augustine, to bring the Church back from the errors of the Pelagians to the pure and severe tenets of the great father. The doctrine of grace, the very corner-stone of the Christian faith, was that which Jansenius labored to revive. Saint Augustine had taught that, before the fall of our first parents, man, being in a state of innocence, could of his own free will do works acceptable to God; but after that his nature was so corrupted, that no good thing could proceed from it, save only as divine grace worked upon him. This grace God gave as He saw fit, working under his eternal decrees, and man, except as predestined and elected to its sovereign help, could accomplish no righteous act, and must incur God's just wrath. But the Pelagians and semi-Pelagians had departed from this doctrine, and attributed a capacity to please God, to man's free will and the deeds proceeding from it—a belief which could but foster his carnal pride and hasten his damnation.

The Jesuits were always desirous to teach religion so that it could most easily be accepted, and they had inclined to semi-Pelagian doctrines, rather than to the difficult truths of St. Augustine. Yet no one questioned his authority. The dispute was as to the exact interpretation of his writings. Jansenius claimed to have nothing in his great book save the very word of Augustine, or its legitimate result. The Jesuits replied that his writings contained neither the doctrine of Augustine nor the truth of God. They appealed to the Pope for the condemnation of these heresies.

Jansenius had died before the publication of his book, but his followers, who were soon named after him, endeavored to defend his works from censure. The Church of Rome has usually been slow in branding as heretical any thing that did not question its authority. With a wise tolerance, it has kept in one fold those whose differences in dogma were greater than divide many Protestant sects.

Jansenius had submitted his writings to the judgment of the Pope. His followers were among the most sincere Catholics. A condemnation that would tend to alienate them seemed unwise; and the Papacy has always inclined towards a discreet treatment of the bewildering questions of predestination and free will.

It was not until 1653 that the influence of the Jesuits succeeded in obtaining the condemnation of the offending book. In that year, Innocent X. issued a bull, by which he condemned as heretical five propositions contained in the Augustinus. The famous five propositions in which it was declared Jansenius had taught heresy, are these: First, that some commandments of God are impossible to the just with the strength they have, no matter what their desires or their efforts, for grace is lacking. Second, that in a state of fallen nature, one never resists interior grace. Third, that to deserve praise or blame, it is not needful that man should have liberty opposed to necessity; it is enough that he should have liberty opposed to constraint. Fourth, that it was a semi-Pelagian heresy to believe that the will of man could choose whether it would resist or obey interior preventing grace; and, fifth, that it was a similar error to hold that Christ had shed his blood generally, and for all men.

The Jansenists have always yielded to the papal authority in admitting that these propositions are heretical. The great strife has been whether the propositions themselves could be found in the Augustinus.

Some, like Lancelot and St. Cyran, took bolder ground, and claimed that the condemned propositions, whether in Jansenius or not, were plainly contained in the writings of St. Augustine. But the dispute was rather one of fact than of belief. Acknowledging the Pope's authority in declaring matters of faith, the Jansenists claimed that in the decision of matters of fact he could err, and his judgment did not necessarily control the faithful. The Jesuits replied that the Pope had alike declared that the propositions were heretical, and that they were contained in the

Augustinus. His authority could not be questioned in either decision.

The heretical statements in their exact wording do not seem to be found in Jansenius. But his great book furnished abundant material for controversy. Louis XIV. ordered the Count of Gramont to read the book and see if he could find the disputed propositions. When the count gave the result of his studies, he said that if the five propositions were there, they were certainly incognito. Among students with less wit and more theological learning, some claimed to find them almost in the very words, while others could discover nothing that countenanced them. The superficial reader finds passages that seem to sustain Innocent in declaring that the book contained the offending propositions. Indeed, he may well think with St. Cyran, that in St. Augustine himself the same views can be discovered. But in these great masses of doctrinal learning, what can apparently be educed from one sentence is often modified and limited in another. It would be presumptuous for most to hazard an opinion when Jansenius himself said that modern theologians seemed not to comprehend "grace, in any degree, or under any form, either that of angels or of men, or before the Fall or since, neither grace sufficient, nor efficacious, nor operative, nor coöperative, nor preventing, nor subsequent, nor exciting, nor assisting."

The members of the Port Royal adopted the Jansenist cause. Saint Cyran had been a fellow worker with Jansenius, and he welcomed the Augustinus as a book to revive and purify the faith of the Church. Saint Cyran died not long after his release from imprisonment, but his teachings had formed the beliefs of those under his influence. The rigid predestinarianism of Jansen had a natural attraction for the stern zeal of the Port Royal. The religion of the convent and of those connected with it bordered on asceticism. They lived in the constant awe of God, seeking little communion with the world, and offering to it little compromise. In such minds, aloof

from earthly interests, the feeling of a close dependence on God grew stronger; the feeling that they, by his eternal decrees, had been chosen and prepared as the vessels of his grace, while the heedless and godless worked out their terrible fate, as the preordained objects of his wrath.

An intense and rigorous religious life adopts an intense and rigorous belief. The Jansenists resembled the English and American Puritans. They shared their Calvinistic tenets and their strict morality. A Jansenist, said the Jesuits, is a Calvinist saying mass. No accusation was more resented by those of the Jansenist party. They sought no alliance with the Protestants. Saint Cyran and Arnauld wrote prolifically against the Calvinists. They were certainly separated from the latter by their strong devotion to two usages of the Catholic Church which were especially objectionable to Protestants—the mass and the confessional.

The formalism and indifference, which were common at the great mystery of the mass, called forth Arnauld's most important work on "The Frequent Communion." The first suggestion of this book is attributed to a trifling incident. The Princess of Guémené declined to go to a ball on a day that she had received the sacrament. Her friend, Mme. de Sablé, remonstrated, and produced a letter from her Jesuit confessor which laid down no such strict rule. This came into the hands of Arnauld,[1] the brother of Mother Angelique, and in reply he published his book. In it he attacked the formal and superstitious use of the communion, and demanded an interior change and sincere repentance, shown in deed as well as word, before the sacrament should be administered and absolution granted. It was an attack upon the endeavor of the Jesuits to make easy and broad the heavenly road, to let the Christian enjoy to the full the pleasures of this world, without danger of missing the bliss of the next.

[1] Antoine Arnauld was the youngest of twenty children; of the ten that reached maturity, nine chose the walks of religion rather than those of the world.

Few devotional works have produced more effect. Though expressed in the dry, syllogistic form in which Arnauld wrote all of his forty-two volumes of doctrinal and combative theology, it kindled a fresh zeal, and was an important aid in bringing to the Port Royal many of the recluses who began to seek there a modern Thebais.

In 1647, Mother Angelique with some of the sisters returned to Port Royal in the Fields. The convent at Paris continued in close relations with it, but the abbey in the fields was to exhibit the most important phases of devotional life.

Before the return of the sisters, this desolate spot had begun to be the refuge for many eminent men, whose careers became identified with the fate of the abbey. "We saw arrive," writes one of them, "from diverse provinces, men of different professions, who, like mariners that had suffered shipwreck, came to seek the Port."

M. le Maitre, a nephew of Mother Angelique, a lawyer of much prominence, a counsellor of state, a favorite of the chancellor and renowned for his eloquent harangues, abandoned present prosperity and future eminence, and in 1638 built a little house, near the monastery, and became the first of those who might be called the hermits of the Port Royal.

Not taking orders, nor becoming a member of any religious body, he sought a life of lonely devotion in this barren place. "I have retired," he writes his father, "into a house by myself, that I may live free from ambition, and seek by penitence to move the Judge before whom all must appear."

Others gradually followed, until there grew up a community, small in numbers, but strong in influence, united in study, in penance, in constant praise and worship. Though held together by no formal vows, few of those who put hand to the plough turned back from the work. They left their beloved retreat only when expelled by force, and with infinite regret. The monastery itself had become dilapidated. It was surrounded by stagnant

waters, and the woods near by were full of snakes. But the recluses found religious joy amid this desolation. "We sang aloud," says one, "that the mingling of our voices might the better show the joy of our souls."

As their numbers increased they did much, however, to improve the desolate retreat they had chosen. When M. d'Andilly left his position at Court for the refuge which he had long desired, he carried to it his taste for gardening, and he spent both time and money in beautifying the place. He still kept up some of his relations with the Court, where he had been one of the most popular of men. Of the choice fruit which he delighted to cultivate, he sent presents to the queen, and to Mazarin and other friends. "To find these clingstone peaches excellent," he writes to Mme. de Sablé when sending some to her, "they must be eaten extremely ripe." Even saints and hermits wish their worldly friends to enjoy the full flavor of their gifts.

M. Hamon, another of the recluses, was the physician for those of the monastery, and for the poor in the vicinity as well. He would leave his solitary studies that he loved, to walk about the neighboring country and towns, treating, with a skill that would have brought him wealth in the world, the sick who had no means to hire a physician.

Late in life, when his infirmities prevented his walking, he rode on an ass with his books open before him. A physician of souls as well, he was at times practically the director of the Port Royal, and he wrote much, breathing a fervent, though sometimes a flowery, piety. "To see him," says Sainte Beuve, "one would give him alms, but he has words of gold; he carries incense and myrrh; he is a king of the Magi in rags."

Some of the recluses cultivated the ground. Others even made shoes, and the Jesuits dubbed them the cobblers. They found occupation not only in such labors and in solitary meditation, but in the more useful work of giving the young an education that was sound in learning

and grounded in piety. The schools of the Port Royal had a troubled existence of about fifteen years. Though they rarely had over fifty pupils, yet in this brief period they left their mark. Racine, Tillemont, and many others of fruitful scholarship and piety were among the pupils who were watched and trained by the grave anchorites with a tender and fostering care. These followers of St. Augustine combined with their stern theology a feminine tenderness for the young.

Said a Jansenist of some misbeliever: "He will not believe that infants who die unbaptized are damned. Imagine such horrible infidelity." Yet St. Cyran, who would have shared in this sentiment, longed to guide the growth of children in wisdom and the fear of the Lord, and his followers found the schools a labor of love. Those engaged in other work were almost jealous of those whose labors were with the children. "One saw here," says Fontaine, himself one of the recluses and their historian, "the children like the olive branches round about the table of the Lord." "The teachers," says another, "watched the little flock continually, without losing them from view, considering them as a precious trust for which God would one day demand a strict account."

Purity of soul and thought, perfect truthfulness, a fresh and natural piety were inculcated. There was no doctrinal theology forced on their young faith. The Jesuits tried to make the queen believe that poisonous doctrines were distilled into the scholars' minds; and that they were called "the little brothers of Grace." "But," says a scholar; "never were children educated in greater simplicity than we. Nowhere was less said of these theological questions than in our schools."

This simple but effective religious training was accompanied by a solid and practical learning. Education was made more difficult then than now. In many schools children were first taught to read in Latin, and the path of wisdom was rendered unduly thorny for youthful feet. But the judicious teachers of the Port Royal taught read-

ing in French, and in many ways did much to improve the methods of French instruction and scholarship. The children were thoroughly trained also in Greek and Latin, in logic and mathematics. Their teachers published admirable manuals for practical study in many branches. "They sought," says one, "to render study more agreeable than play or games."

The jealousy of the Jesuits, who were well aware of the advantages of controlling the education of the young, at last obtained the order for the final dispersion of these little schools, and in 1660 they were closed for ever.

Besides these manuals for teaching, the literature of the Port Royal comprised many controversial works, chief among them the forty-two volumes of Arnauld. It furnished also a translation of the Bible by Saci, which, though far from possessing the merits of the English version of King James, is one of the best of the many French translations. But the works of Blaise Pascal were the great productions of the Port Royal, as he himself was its chief glory. The famous Provincial Letters originated from the controversy over Jansenism, though they soon turned from doctrinal questions to an attack on the morality of the Jesuits that permanently injured the influence of that body. Arnauld had published some letters in 1655 defending Jansenism, and for these he was solemnly condemned at the Sorbonne by a vote of 124 to 71. "They thought it better to censure than to answer," said Pascal, "because it was so much easier to find monks than reasons."

Pascal himself took up the controversy almost accidentally. In four letters supposed to be addressed to a provincial friend, he discussed the condemnation of Arnauld and the disputed questions of grace, with a skill sometimes approaching lightness, that differed greatly from the treatises of the ordinary Jansenist theologian, which distracted the divine and lulled the profane to sleep. Encouraged by their success Pascal followed with the great attack on the morality taught by the Jesuits.

Jesuitical has become with us a word of reproach. The services the Society of Jesus has rendered religion, its missionary work in every part of heathendom, the zeal of its martyrs, the devotion of its members, all that they have done for the cause of charity, for the spread of Christianity, for the succor of the distressed, for the relief of the destitute, for the protection of the oppressed, is obscured and clouded by a horror for the teachings, which allowed any immorality and countenanced any crime that seemed necessary for the preservation and extension of their own influence.

The position of the Jesuits before the Provincial Letters was far different. They had indeed bitter opponents. They had formerly been expelled from France; and they were charged with countenancing regicide when the king was their enemy. But their unwavering fidelity gave them a controlling influence with the Papacy, which excited the envy of other orders. The confessors of almost every crowned head and great noble; they had a political power which made them dreaded, and often hated. Their influence was little impaired by the accusations of their opponents. Most people regarded them as quite as good as the members of the other great orders, and much more zealous.[1] Exerting a great power, they might sometimes be unscrupulous in obtaining it, or mild in their condemnation of the crimes of those who supported them, but such faults did not distinguish them from many other ecclesiastics. Occasional attacks on the teachings of some of the casuists of the order were read with indifference.

Such was the position of the society when Pascal resolved to meet their assaults on the theology of the Port Royal, by an attack on the morality of their own teachings. Under the form of conversations with an amiable but confiding Jesuit, he displayed copious extracts from the tenets of their writers, the rules which might guide

[1] Mazarin, in his Carnets, in 1644–5, speaks of the great influence of the Jesuits, and how impolitic it would be to do any thing to offend so active and powerful a body.

the confessional, which should authorize absolution, which could be safely practised by those under their charge. All was so arranged and enlivened that the most indifferent reader would find it entertaining. The extracts in which these dangerous teachings were found were so full, so numerous, made from so many writers of high standing in the order, that it was impossible for the Jesuits to reply that the letters were mere prejudiced summaries, garbled and distorted from misunderstood texts. Pascal did not claim, nor could it be claimed, that this great society was devoted to the corruption of morals. But, as he justly said, their object was not solely to reform them, for that would be impolitic. To the pious they gladly taught a pure morality, but, for those who clung to their favorite sins, a specious explanation could cover them, and ensure to the sinner who would wisely intrust the care of his soul to a Jesuit, the indulgence of his desires and the pardon of heaven upon his acts. Many of their writers were as severe in their teachings as St. Cryan, and as spiritual as St. Francis of Sales. But many others taught a very different code, and the authority of one learned doctor rendered his opinion probable, and it might be safely followed by the confessor, even though a great majority of other doctors disapproved it. For it was said that a man given to study would not espouse an opinion, unless induced by some good and sufficient reason.

In the copious writings of the Jesuitical casuists opinions could be found, and could thus be safely followed, which would accommodate the penitent, if his vices were any thing but enmity to the Society of Jesus. Among them were such precepts as these: Fasting is prescribed, yet if one cannot sleep without his supper, then he may eat it. But must he go without his dinner? Far from it, for no one is obliged to change the order of his meals. So also, said Fillincius, he might be relieved from fasting if he were fatigued, even if his fatigue arose from committing a crime, or though he had wearied himself expressly to be relieved from his fast. Temptation to sin should be avoided, yet

not if it would give the community occasion to talk or would cause inconvenience. The rich must give of their superfluity. But what is superfluous? One needs what is required for his position and his relatives. "A man of the world" says Vasquez, "can hardly have any superfluous wealth left for charity." Simony is forbidden, but here we must distinguish. If one gives money for a benefice it is plainly simony. But if one gives the money in order to move the holder to confer it, Valentia tells us, he may do that. So also, servants should not do immoral errands, and if they consent to their masters' crimes they cannot be absolved. "Yet," says Bauny: "we must confess it is otherwise, if they do such things for their own temporal gain." "Nay more," says Bauny, "can servants add to their wages by taking their masters' goods? They may sometimes, when they are so poor that in seeking a position they are obliged to accept any offer, and other servants of their sort receive better pay." The intention, not the act, is to be justly considered. So, though duelling is wrong, yet if one should go to the appointed place only with the intention of defending himself, that he safely may do. And as no one is bound to forfeit his honor, he may rightly kill the man who, by inflicting a blow, or calling him a liar, seeks to destroy that which is dearer than life. "For otherwise," as Azor justly puts it, "the honor of the innocent would be constantly exposed to the malice of the insolent." But this did not justify the Jesuits in killing the Jansenists, "for," says Caramuel, "the Jansenists call the Jesuits Pelagians. Can one kill them for that? No, for the Jansenists no more could obscure the glory of the society than an owl the sun. They only make it seem brighter."

For usurers the devices were suggested which have been the unavailing defence of Shylocks in every court of law, but which could be successfully pleaded in the courts of conscience. Judges themselves were subjected to a peculiar rule. Most gains however illegal could be kept, and Escobar says one may keep what one receives for murders

and for infamous crimes; for the possession is just, and one owns what one has gained. Yet Molina, Escobar, and others, agree that a judge must return what has been paid him for justice, for that he is bound to render, but he is not required to give back what he has received for an unjust decision, for that, if given at all, ought to be paid for. The rule about oaths is familiar. Sanchez lays it down in these words: "One may swear he has not done a thing, although he has, by understanding with himself that he did not do it on a certain day, or before he was born, or by supposing some other circumstance that the words used do not make known; and this is very serviceable in many instances, and is always just when it is necessary or useful for life, or honor, or property." "Nor," says Escobar, "do promises bind, when one did not intend to bind himself when he made them." Even the pains of such penance as would be imposed on one whom all these devices could not save from sin might be made very light by the confessor, says Escobar, "if the penitent declares that he wishes to wait till the other world for his penance, and to suffer in purgatory all the pangs that are his due."

Such were some of the ingenious resorts of a relaxed morality which Pascal gathered from the Jesuit teachers and spread before the world. Many other similar maxims are to be found in his letters. They showed one phase of the policy of the great order, which sought to exert its influence over all society, and ministered alike to the saint and the sinner. It was the code under which a politic confessor could absolve a king confessing his amours, abandoned an hour before, to be resumed an hour later; could tell the plunderer and the defrauder that he must do penance for his crime, but no law required the only penance he feared—the restoration of his illegal gains; that told the gentleman he might fight a duel with right intentions, and not suffer the ban of the church; which made the Jesuits the confessors, the spiritual, and often the temporal directors of the most of those who held power, and wealth, and place in the world.

The society was not a body of evil-workers, which, of choice, inculcated such a morality. It would gladly have had all those to whom it ministered ghostly aid willing to practise the morals, as well as profess the faith of Christ. But if a large part of the world was resolved to do evil, the members of the order accepted the fact as they found it.

The Jesuits hardly attempted any reply to the Provincial Letters, for reply was impossible. The decline that results from such attacks is gradual. For a time the influence of the order seemed little weakened. The Provincial Letters were placed on the Index, at Rome, as tainted with the heresies of Jansenius. In 1660, they were publicly burned in Paris by the common hangman. Jesuit confessors absolved Louis XIV., and controlled the policy of the end of his reign. Their society saw the Jansenists utterly overthrown, and the Port Royal a deserted waste. But, amid all these apparent victories, the order was slowly meeting the fate of any religious body that tries to hold its power by making terms with the mammon of unrighteousness. "It had," says the historian of the Port Royal, "sought to erect Macchiavellianism under the shadow of the cross." The French clergy solemnly repudiated the relaxed morality. Popes condemned its teachings. The next century saw the Jesuits expelled from France, and, at last, the Papacy itself dissolved the great order of the followers of Ignatius Loyola.

It was, indeed, again revived. It exists to-day, but it is only the pale shadow of its former self, exiled even from Catholic countries, reduced in wealth, diminished in numbers, hardly possessing historical continuity with that great society which once checked Protestanism, controlled the Papacy, and guided the politics of half the governments of Europe.

The Provincial Letters for a while diminished the vigor of the assaults on the Port Royal. But the bull condemning the Augustinus was accepted by the great majority of the French clergy, and, in 1656, the General Assembly

adopted a formulary, which was to be signed by every ecclesiastic, and even by nuns. It was in these words: "I submit myself sincerely to the constitution of our holy father, Innocent X., and I condemn with heart and mouth the doctrine of the five propositions of Cornelius Jansenius, which the Pope and the bishops have condemned, a doctrine which is not that of Saint Augustine, whom Jansenius has ill explained, and is contrary to the true meaning of that great doctor." Delay, however, ensued in compelling the signature of this formulary. Not only did Pascal's attacks divert the zeal of the Jesuits, but the miracles, of which the monastery of Port Royal was the scene, had their effect upon the public mind as proofs of the sanctity of its inmates.

The most notable of these miracles was that of the holy thorn, by which Marguerite Perier, a child of ten, afflicted with a terrible lachrymal fistula or ulcer, pressed the sacred relic while adoring it, and was cured of her malady. Modern science can furnish plausible suggestions for the cure without the aid of miraculous healing, and in our admiration for the independent spirit and the piety of the Port Royal, we could wish that its inmates had attached less faith to miraculous interposition in their behalf. But a primitive devotion often induces a primitive facility of belief. Not only the sisters, but the recluses found comfort in this and other like miracles, as being the visible proof of God's favor.

The miracle of the thorn occurred during the publication of Pascal's letters, and he used it with a sublime rhetoric. He accused the Jesuits of having calumniated the faith of the nuns, and said: "While these holy virgins, night and day, adore Christ in the sacrament, you cease not, night and day, to say that they do not believe his presence in the Eucharist. You caluminate those who have neither ears to listen to you, nor a mouth with which to answer; but Jesus Christ hears you, and answers for them. We listen to-day to that holy and terrible voice, which astounds nature and consoles the church. I fear that those who

harden their hearts and refuse, with obstinacy, to hear him, when he speaks as God, will be forced to listen with terror, when he speaks to them as their judge."

The respite granted the Port Royal was brief. In 1660 the schools were dispersed, and in 1661 the formulary was again presented for signature. Most of the members of the monastery refused to sign. Their reasons were not always of the best. They were ignorant nuns. They could not read the great Latin books of Jansenius, nor discover whether they contained the heretical propositions.

But with however poor logic, they stood firm in their refusal. They were somewhat too zealous for legal forms, for protests and appeals, like the true daughters of Parliamentary families, as many of them were. They were a little too filled with the idea that the persecutions of Diocletian were revived in the distresses of one small nunnery, but they were always brave, fervent, and deserving our sympathy.

Their pensionaries, those who had not yet assumed the veil, were taken away from them. The recluses were scattered. Some of the sisters were removed. An interdict was laid on the Port Royal. The Eucharist was denied them. They were left in spiritual hunger, as well as in physical need. Some yielded and signed, usually only to regard themselves, and be regarded by their sisters, as those who had proved recreant to the faith. Mother Angelique died in 1661, in the beginning of the persecution. Fifty-five years of a life devoted to God did not deliver her from a terrible fear when death came. As the end drew near, she cried: "All that I have imagined is less than nothing, in comparison with what I feel and comprehend at this hour." But at last she took courage and hoped for mercy. "I promise," she said to her confessor, "I will no longer be afraid of God."

"How great a thing it is to die in the hope of eternal life," her sister had said, as she was dying nineteen years before.

The troubles of the Jansenists were for a while stopped

by the Peace of the Church in 1669. Four Jansenist bishops, headed by the saintly Pavillon, agreed on a modified formulary, which they could sign, and the members of the Port Royal followed their example. The difference was not great, but it sufficed. The interdict was raised, and the Port Royal enjoyed ten years of peace.

It was during this time that it may be said to have become fashionable. Mme. de Sablé, Mme. de Longueville, Mme. de Liancourt, and other ladies there sought refuge from the pomps and disappointments of the world. Those who had been famous for gallantry and active in the intrigues of the Fronde, became, as Rochefoucauld jestingly said, the mothers of the church.

They afforded a worldly protection in return for spiritual aid. But the death of Mme. de Longueville in 1679 left the Port Royal exposed to the king's hostility, and a persecution began which lasted for thirty years. On the 29th of October, 1709, all who were then left at the monastery, twenty-two maidens, of whom the youngest was fifty and some were over eighty, were removed under the orders of the lieutenant of the police. The abbey of the Port Royal in the Fields was dissolved by the decree of the Archbishop of Paris, five hundred years after its foundation, and a hundred years after the reform of Mother Angelique. The buildings were left to decay, and even the bodies buried there were dug up and removed. The place was forbidden as a refuge for the living or the dead.

INDEX.

ACADEMY, French, visited by Queen Christian, ii. 311; organized by Richelieu, 436; its influence, 464.
Accounts, Chamber of, its unsuccessful remonstrances, ii. 228.
Aids, Court of, verifies edict for taxes, i. 313.
Aiguillon, Duchess of: property left her by Richlieu, i. 229; holds governorship of Havre, 284.
Alexander VII., Pope Fabio Chigi: nuncio at Münster, i. 455, 477; Secretary of State, ii. 163; hostile to Jansenism, 165; made cardinal, 168; his conduct in reference to Retz, 271, 272, 274; sends brief to Paris, 275; it is not received, 276; baptizes Queen Christine, 309.
Algeria, relations with France, ii. 369.
Alsace, Condition of, i. 317; ceded to France, 468, 469, 478; sufferings from war, 403, 404.
Amiens, Conspiracy of, i. 180.
Ancre, Marshal of (see Concini).
Andilly, Arnauld d', ii. 482.
Angelique, Mother (see Jaqueline Arnauld).
Angers, Siege of, ii. 169.
Anjou, Province of: submits to king, ii. 170.
Anne of Austria, Marriage of, i. 64; her correspondence with the Spanish, 199; denies the offence, 200; is pardoned, 201; appointed regent, 249; has edict revoked, 257, 261; retains Mazarin, 262–264; abandons the Importants, 293; her letters to Mazarin, 297, 298; reproves judges, 310; urged to make peace, 336; her quarrels with the Parliament, 396, 401, 405; allows union in Chamber of St. Louis, 407; orders Broussel's arrest, 426; her conduct towards Retz, 431, 432; leaves Paris, 437, ii. 6; conduct towards Condé, 438; wishes right of arbitrary arrest, 442; her resentment at Condé, ii. 12; receives the Frondeurs unfavorably, 40; returns to Paris, 44; endeavors to leave Paris, 107; her disconsolate condition, 108; causes discord among leaders of Fronde, 114; agrees to call States-General, 116, 117; her feelings for Mazarin, 126; makes terms with the Frondeurs, 133, 134; attacks Condé, 135; leaves Paris, 150; eagerness to see Mazarin, 156, 160; desires Louis' marriage with Maria Theresa, 319, 323.
Annese, Gennaro, i. 363, 364, 365, 366, 369.
Army, Bad condition of French, i. 181–183, 338; cost of, under Richelieu, 212; license of, 275, ii. 183, 184; size and condition of, 362, 363.
Arnauld, Antoine, his writings, ii. 480, 484.
Arnauld, Jacqueline, Abbess of Port Royal, ii. 472, 473; her zeal, 474, 475; her death, 491.
Arnoux, Father, Louis' confessor, i. 87.
Arras, City of, captured by the French, i. 208; besieged by the Spanish, 256, 257; the siege raised, 258; importance of this, 259.
Artois, Province of, ceded to France, ii. 332.
Augustinus, The, ii. 477, 478, 479.
Avaux, Count of, made superintendent, i. 283; makes peace between Sweden and Denmark, 319; ambassador at Münster, 456; his Catholic zeal, 457, 474; disgraced, 475.

Ballets, ii. 433, 434, 435.
Balzac, ii. 463, 464.
Banier, General, i. 452, 453.
Barberini, Cardinal Antonio: appointed legate, i. 237; his corruption, 340; protector of France at Rome, 341; abandons the French, 342; is prosecuted, 344, ii. 269; supports Chigi, 270.
Barbin, receives office from Concini, i. 73; thrown in bastille, 79.
Barillon, President, is arrested, i. 310.
Barley, Price of, ii. 389.
Barricades, at Paris, i. 433–435.
Bartholomew, Massacre of Saint, injures Protestant cause, i. 6.
Bassompierre, Marshal of: his favor with Louis, i. 93; his insubordination, 124; his arrest, 137; released from imprisonment, 245; extravagance of, ii. 414, 415, 416.
Bastille, The treasure in, i. 15, 24; capture of, ii. 16; is surrendered to the king, 215.
Bavaria, invaded by Gustavus Adolphus, i. 164; pillaged, 323, 474, 475; obtains Upper Palatinate, 479.
Bavaria, Duke of (see Maximilian).
Bavaria, Elector of, declines being candidate for emperor, ii. 314.
Béarn, Province of: condition of church there, i. 85; Catholics restored, 86, 88.
Beaufort, Duke of, quarrels with Condé, i. 253; his character, 256; plans to murder Mazarin, 291; is arrested, 292; escape of, 407; returns to Paris, ii. 16; his popularity there, 41; accused before Parliament, 56; promised the admiralty, 70; commands Orleans' army, 171; quarrels with Nemour, 174; excites the mob of Paris, 181, 187; stops massacre at Hotel de Ville, 198; his duel with Nemour, 201; resigns his position, 212; is banished, 214.
Beauvais, Bishop of, leader of the Importants, i. 256; active with Parliament, 259–261; made minister, 282; sent to his diocese, 293.
Beck, General, i. 423, 424; his character, 426; is arrested, 427.
Bed of Justice, i. 310, 311, 394; ii. 227, 228, 278.
Bellegarde, Duke of, Governor of Burgundy, i. 72; uses magic mirror against Concini, 72.
Bellièvre, President, ii. 280–282.
Bibliothèque Royale, ii. 437, 443.
Blancménil, President, i. 403; is arrested, 427.
Bleneau, Battle of, ii. 175.
Blois, Château of, Mary de Medici confined there, i. 81.
Bohemia, Troubles in, i. 147; forced conversions in, 149, 151.
Boileau, ii. 462, 464, 465.
Bois de Boulogne, ii. 446.
Bonneval, deputy of the nobility, beats plebeian deputy, i. 51.
Bordeaux, City of, receives Princess of Condé, ii. 74; besieged by the king, 76; makes peace, 79, 80; condition of parties in, 232; revolutionary sentiments in, 233; contests in the city, 235; desires peace, 238; sends envoys to England, 239; besieged by the king, 243; makes peace, 244; terms granted it, 245.
Bordeaux, minister to England, his negotiations with Cromwell, ii. 289–292, 298.
Bouillon, Duke of, his character, i. 65; joins in Soissons' resurrection, 209; intrigues with Cinq Mars, 217; makes treaty with Spain, 218; is arrested, 222; is pardoned, 226; joins the Fronde, ii. 12; opposes peace, 27; his demands, 34; engaged in rebellion at Bordeaux, 79, 80; refuses to assist Condé, 148.
Bourbon, Hall of, opened for States-General, i. 42.
Bouteville, executed for duelling, i. 115.
Bouthillier, member of council, i. 247; appointed member of council, 249; dismissed, 283.
Braganza, Duke of (see John IV.).
Brandenburg, Elector of, one of possessory princes, i. 19; joins Gustavus Adolphus, 161; acquires Pomerania, 174; strengthened by treaty of Westphalia, 478, 479.
Bread, quality of, furnished to soldiers, ii. 15; price and quality of, 390, 391.
Breitenfeld, Battle of, i. 162.
Bremen annexed to Sweden, i. 478.
Brézé, Duke of, his victory at Carthagena, i. 279; commands expedition to Italy, 347; is killed, 348.
Bribery, prevalence of, ii. 425, 426.
Brienne, Count of, made Secretary of State, i. 283
Brienne, Mme. de, her conversation with the queen about Mazarin, i. 296, 297.

Brisach ceded to France, i. 468.
Broussel, his remarks in Parliament, i. 418; returns to the Parliament, 435; opposes peace of Ruel, ii. 29; his lack of ability, 30; accused before Parliament, 56; countenances violences of mob, 189; chosen provost of merchants, 199; resigns his position, 210; is banished from Paris, 214; his popularity gone, 215.
Brun, Dutch minister, i. 458.
Buckingham, Duke of, relations with Anne of Austria, i. 100; repulsed at Fort St. Martin, 120.
Bufalini, Ortensia, mother of Mazarin, i. 233.
Butchers, Tax upon, ii. 251.

Cabs, Public, first used, ii. 446, 447.
Canada, trade with, i. 112; colonization in, ii. 369.
Candale, Duke of, ii. 48; general in Guienne, 236, 237; enters Bordeaux, 245.
Cardinals, edict against their holding office, ii. 118–120.
Carmelites, Convent of, in Faubourg St. Jacques, i. 290.
Carnets of Mazarin, nature of, i. 272; extracts from, 286–288.
Carré, Father, agent for Richelieu with Mlle. Lafayette, i. 195.
Carriages, Use of, ii. 446.
Casal, its siege and relief, i. 129; its second siege, 207; treaty made at, 239; captured by the Spanish, ii. 224.
Castelnau, ii. 282.
Castelnauduf, Battle of, i. 140.
Castles, Destruction of, i. 110.
Catalonia, Province of, description of, i. 205; revolts against Spain and is annexed to France, 206; resists the Spanish, ii. 44; conquered by the Spanish, 224–226; campaigns in, 284; yielded to Spain, 332.
Caussin, Father, Louis XIII.'s confessor, i. 196; his conversations with the king, 197; is dismissed, 199.
Cerdagne, County of, annexed to France, i. 206.
Chabot, Rohan, Duke of, ii. 169, 170; leaves Paris, 212.
Chalais, Count of, conspiracy of, i. 116; execution of, 117.
Chamber of Justice, appointed by Richelieu, i. 107; demanded, 412; granted, 417; amounts recovered by it, ii. 361.
Charles I. of England marries Henriette of France, i. 100.
Charles II. of England required to leave France, ii. 294, 297; ally of Spain, 305; asks for assistance, 330.
Charles Gustavus of Sweden, ii. 345.
Charlevoix seizes Brisach, ii. 232; arrested, 233; terms made with him, 249.
Charnacé, Count of, arranges truce for Sweden, i. 156.
Charrier, Abbé of, Retz's agent at Rome, ii. 161; his conduct there, 163–167.
Chassebras, Curé of the Madeleine, vicar for Retz, ii. 273, 274.
Chateauneuf, Marquis of, released from prison, i. 281; not restored to office, 287, 288; sent from Paris, 439; restored to the ministry, ii. 69; is removed, 121; made first minister, 144; opposed to Mazarin, 156; retires to Tours, 161; his death, 214.
Chatillon, Mme. de, lady-love of Condé, ii. 145; advises peace, 179; banished from Paris, 214; her relations with Hocquincourt, 283, 284.
Châtre, La, colonel of Swiss guards, i. 282.
Châtre, Marshal de la, marches to Juliers, i. 18, 19.
Chavigni, member of council, i. 247–249; loses Mazarin's favor, 283; arrested, 439; recalled to office, ii. 120; disgraced, 145; his death, 208.
Chevalier, ii. 237.
Chevreuse, Duchess of, begins her intrigues, i. 115; sent into exile, 117; edict against her recall, 250; returns from Brussels, 281; her relations with the queen, 282; given 200,000 livres, 282; attacks Richelieu's family, 284; loses Anne's favor and retires, 294; friendly with court, ii. 59; negotiates for Retz, 91; allies herself with Mazarin, 128, 133.
Chevreuse, Mlle. de, relations with Retz, ii. 60; to be married to Conti, 100; engagement is broken, 124; is to marry Mazarin's nephew, 134; dies, 135.
Chigi, Fabio, cardinal, nuncio at Münster, i. 457, 458; opposed by Mazarin, ii., 268; his conduct at the conclave, 270; elected Pope, 270. (See Alexander VII.)

Chocolate, its use, ii., 431.
Christian IV. of Denmark takes part in Thirty Years' War, i. 155; negotiates preliminary treaty of peace, 455.
Christine, Queen of Sweden, ii. 307; her eccentricities, 308; visits France, 309; guilty of murder, 310; leaves France, 311.
Cinq Mars, becomes favorite of Louis XIII., i. 213; his quarrels with the king, 215; makes a treaty with Spain, 218; tries to overthrow Richelieu, 219; hopes to marry Mary of Mantua, 221; is arrested, 222; his trial and execution, 226.
Cities, Indebtedness of, ii. 394, 395.
Clergy, position in States-General, i. 32; delegates from, 41; less Gallican than under Louis XIV., 48; poverty of lower clergy, 57; cahiers of, 58; Huguenot clergy, 87; quarrel with the Parliament, ii. 118, 119; present petitions for Retz, 218, 219; defend his position, 262, 263; object to his trial before Parliament, 265; their offices sold, 424; fees allowed, 455; religious condition of, 470, 471.
Cleves, Duke of, his possessions left to many heirs, i. 7, 19.
Cluny, Hotel de, residence of the nuncios, i. 240.
Coffee, little used, ii. 431, 432.
Colbert, Jean Baptiste, criticises Emeri's policy, i. 308, 309; made superintendent for Mazarin, ii. 249; his management of Mazarin's property, 250; his demands for himself, 251; complaints of Fouquet, 335, 342; improvements under, 448.
Coligny, Maurice de, his duel with Guise, i. 299, 300.
Cologne, chosen place for conference, i. 183, 451.
Colonna, Constable, employs Mazarin's father, i. 232; marries Marie Mancini, ii. 352.
Commerce, condition of, ii. 365–369.
Concini, Concino, Marshal of Ancre, early career, i. 12; marries Leonora Galigni, 13; offices and money given him, 25; surrenders Amiens, 67; his wealth and fame, 71; assassinated, 78; remains torn from grave, 79.
Concini, Leonora, favorite of Mary de Medici, i. 12; marries Concino Concini, 13; executed for treason and magic, 14.
Condé, Henry, Prince of, wealth and influence of, i. 21; returns to Paris, 24; leads a revolt, 27; makes peace, 28; leads another revolt, 63; makes peace, 67; his power, 68; his arrest, 70; amounts paid him, 76; leads the army against the Huguenots, 127; invades Franche Comté, 177; defeated at Fontarabia, 185; appointed member of council, 249; quarrels with Beaufort, 253; president of council, 261.
Condé, Louis, Prince of, marries Richelieu's niece, i. 212; his education, 265; his appearance, 266; receives command of army, 267; leads French at Rocroi, 268–270; returns to Paris, 273; captures Thionville, 273; joins Guebriant, 274; receives Chantilly, 282; his victory at Freiburg, 315–317; marches into Germany, 320; victory at Nordlingen, 321; captures Dunkirk, 329; declines going to Naples, 357; defeated at Lerida, 378; wins the battle of Lens, 422; returns to Paris, 437, 438; takes part in conference, 442; defeats Frondeurs at Charenton, ii. 18; his unpopularity at Paris, 40; his followers, 45; quarrels with Mazarin, 49; terms granted him, 50; pretended assault upon, 55; arrest of, 65; imprisoned at Havre, 88; released, 109; returns to Paris, 110; quarrels with Frondeurs, 123; abandons Molé, 125; made governor of Guienne, 125; goes to St. Maur, 130; quarrels with regent, 132–135; disturbances with Retz, 137; edict in favor of, 139; retires to Frie, 145; again in rebellion, 146; makes treaty with Spain, 147; is unsuccessful, 150; opposes Retz's elevation, 165; makes treaty with Orleans, 168; leaves Guienne, 170; successful at Bleneau, 175; enters Paris, 176; negotiates for peace, 180; curries favor with the populace, 181, 186; captures St. Denis, 182; bravery at battle of Faubourg St. Antoine, 190–194; conduct at massacre of Hotel de Ville, 195, 196, 198, 199; demands exorbitant terms of peace, 209; joins the Spanish, 211; responsible for loss of Catalonia, 225, commands the enemy in Champagne, 226; adproves of Ormée, 235; neglects

Guienne, 239; sends envoys to England, 239; favors Huguenots, 243; commands Spanish army, 246, 247; condemned for high treason, 252; discontented with Spanish, 253; besieges Arras, 256; quarrels with Turenne, 282; his praise of Cromwell, 295; his victory at Valenciennes, 299, 300; his conduct at battle of Dunes, 305; abandoned by Pimentel, 322; negotiations concerning, 327; terms granted, 328; becomes a courtier, 344.
Condé, Princess of, quarrels with Mme. de Montbazon, i. 291; asks release of her son, ii. 72; her death, 96.
Condé, Claire Clemence, Princess of, takes up arms for her husband, ii. 72; received at Bordeaux, 74; makes terms, 80.
Constable, Office of, its holders, i. 94; is abolished, 95.
Conterini, mediator at Münster, i. 458.
Conti, Prince of, affection for his sister, ii. 11; declared generalissimo, 12; introduces Spanish envoy, 20; his lack of courage, 32; arrest of, 65; released, 109; his engagement with Mlle. de Chevreuse, 123, 124; joins the Ormée, 236; makes terms with the king, 243, 244; marries Mazarin's niece, 252; commands in Catalonia, 284.
Copyright, ii. 437.
Corneille, Pierre, patronized by Fouquet, ii. 340; by Richelieu, 435; his dramas, 466, 467.
Counterfeiters, ii. 454.
Cours la Reine, ii. 445, 446.
Cromwell, Protector, negotiates with Condé and Bordeaux, ii. 239, 240, 241; his negotiations with France and Spain, 287–293; his letters to Mazarin, 289, 291; dismisses French envoy, 293; demands that the Stuarts shall leave France, 294; interferes for the Vaudois, 296; sends ambassador to France, 298; allies himself with Mazarin, 297, 301; complains of the French, 303.
Croquants, i. 304, 306.

Dancing, ii. 421.
Daugnon, Count of, endeavors to betray La Rochelle, ii. 150; Condé wishes him made marshal, 209; deserts Condé, 238, 239.
Day of the Dupes, i. 135.
Descartes, Réné, visits Christine of Sweden, ii. 308; his writings, 466.
De Thou, friend of Cinq Mars, i. 217; negotiates for peace, 219; is arrested, 222; carried to Lyons, 225; executed, 226.
Devereux, Captain, murders Wallenstein, i. 178.
Dinner, Hours for, ii. 430; luxury at, 430, 431.
Doctors, Fees of, ii. 429.
Dress, Richness of, ii. 140; Spanish dress, 335; cost of, 415, 416; of judges, 428.
Duelling, Frequency of, i. 114; ii. 419.
Dunes, Battle of, ii. 305, 306.
Dunkirk, City of, description of, i. 327; siege of, 329; captured by Spanish, ii. 223; besieged, 304; surrendered to the English, 306.
Du Plessis, Marshal of, his victory at Rethel, ii. 93.
Duretête, leader of Ormée, ii. 234, 238; favors Spain, 241; executed, 245.
Düthlingen, Defeat of the French at, i. 276.

Edict of restitution, i. 151.
Education, neglect of, ii. 392, 421; at Port Royal, 483, 484.
Elboeuf, Duke of, general-in-chief of Fronde, ii. 10.
Electors of Germany, corruption among, ii. 279, 280.
Emeri, controller, i. 302; revives old taxes, 307; his injudicious measures, 308; removed from office, 416; returns to office, ii. 53.
Empire, The, how affected by treaty of Westphalia, i. 479, 482; by League of the Rhine, ii. 316, 317.
Enghien, Duke of (see Louis, Prince of Condé).
England, declares war with France, i. 118; treaty made, 130; captures French ships, ii. 223; treatment by other governments, 286; power on the sea, 288, 290; influence in Europe, 296; makes treaty with France, 297, 301; declares war on Spain, 298; diminished influence of, 330.
Épernon, Jean Louis, Duke of, accused of Henry IV.'s murder, i. 13, 14; governor of Metz, 24; rescues soldiers from prison, 49; quarrels with Parliament, 50; amounts paid him, 76.

Épernon, Duke of, (son of the above,) his tyranny in Guienne, ii. 36 ; his unpopularity there, 73 ; leaves the province, 77.
Estrades, Marquis of, his negotiations in Holland, i. 333.
L'État c'est moi ; origin of this saying, ii. 279, 280.
Eugene, Prince of Savoy, son of Olympe Mancini, ii. 352.

Faubourg St. Antoine, Battle of, ii. 189–194.
Ferdinand II., elected king of Bohemia, i. 146 ; chosen emperor, 147 ; his persecutions, 148 ; conquers Bohemia, 149 ; publishes edict of restitution, 151 ; his plans, 152 ; recalls Wallenstein, 165 ; his death, 174.
Ferdinand III., emperor, narrowly escapes capture, i. 453 ; ratifies preliminary treaty, 455 ; terms proposed by him at Münster, 460, 461, 464 ; his death, ii. 311.
Ferro, Luigi del, i. 364.
Filhot, ii. 237, 238.
Finances, condition of, under Sully, i. 51 ; statement of, in 1614, 52–54 ; amount of pensions, 76 ; condition of, under Richelieu, 301–307, 392 ; payments à comptant, 413 ; public bankruptcy, 416, 417 ; condition of, in 1648, 443 ; regulation of, 444, 445 ; depreciation of coinage, i. 300, 301 ; disorders in ; 336, 337 ; inefficient system, 359–362 ; cost of collecting taxes, 379, 380 ; amount of debt, 380 ; sale of offices, 381.
Financiers, wealth of, ii. 361 ; gains of, 379, 380.
Fontaine, or Fuentes, Count of, his bravery at Rocroi, i. 270.
Fontarabia, Siege of, i. 184.
Fontrailles, negotiates a treaty with Spain, i. 217 ; leaves France, 221.
Fort St. Louis, agreement for its destruction is not executed, i. 105.
Fouquet, Nicholas, made procureur-general, ii. 91 ; made superintendent of finance, 230 ; his ability, 335 ; corruption, 336, 338 ; wealth, 338 ; prodigality, 339 ; patronizes art, 340 ; his plots, 341 ; overthrow, 343.
France, government of, i. 1–5 ; condition under Henry IV., 26, 27 ; different provinces of, 35 ; expenses and revenues under Richelieu, 111 ; makes treaty with Sweden, 156 ; takes part in the Thirty Years' War, 168 ; declares war against Spain, 174 ; makes treaty with Holland, 175 ; relief at Richelieu's death, 229 ; oppression from taxes, 303 ; does not wish too great success in Germany, 324 ; desires Low Countries, 331 ; influence in Italy, 349 ; bankruptcy of, 416 ; character of war with Spain, 449 ; terms demanded at Münster, 461–463, 465 ; joy at the cession of Alsace, 469 ; identified with empire of Charlemagne, 469 ; politics of, personal, ii. 70 ; its superiority in war, 220 ; losses from the Fronde, 221–226 ; influence in Germany, 313, 318 ; gains by peace of Pyrenees, 332 ; influence in Europe, 344 ; suffering from taxation, 370 ; condition of people, 382–383, 391, 393, 409, 410 ; population of, 383, 384 ; religious condition, 469.
Franche Comté, invaded by the French, i. 177 ; condition of, 318.
Frederick V., Elector Palatine, elected king of Bohemia, i. 148 ; defeated at Weissenberg, 149 ; driven from the Palatinate, 150.
Freiburg, Battle of, i. 315–317.
Frequent Communion, The, ii. 480.
Friedlane, Duke of (see Wallenstein).
Fronde, name of, i. ; character of, 410–412 ; reaches open war, ii. 8 ; allied with Mazarin, 70 ; its leaders dissolve their alliance, 122–124 ; end of Parliamentary Fronde, 215 ; injury it causes to France, 221–226 ; little and great Fronde at Bordeaux, 234 ; last phase of Fronde, 245.
Fuensaldagne, Count of, quarrels with Condé, ii. 246 ; his inefficiency, 247.

Gabelle, ii. 52 ; nature and amount of, i. 53, ii. 376, 377 ; violations of, 378.
Gambling, Prevalence of, ii. 417, 418.
Gardens, ii. 441.
Gassion, Marshal of, his services at Rocroi, i. 268–270 ; made marshal, 274 ; subdues insurrection in Normandy, 305 ; his death, 338.
Gaston (see Duke of Orleans).
Gayant, President, i. 310.
Gazette, The, ii. 438.
Genoa, invaded by the French, i. 105.
Germany, disordered condition of, i. 153 ; injury from Thirty Years'

War, 174; condition of, during Thirty Years' War, 449–451; how affected by peace of Westphalia, 481–483; influence of Spain and France, ii. 315, 317.
Gonzagna, Anna of (see Princess Palatine).
Gonzagna, Marie, Princess of, friend of Cinq Mars, i. 221; early life, 350; marries king of Poland, 352.
Gourville, Hérault de, attempts to kidnap Retz, ii. 155.
Gramont, Marshal of, his conduct at Lens, i. 424; envoy at German congress, ii. 312; his conduct, 314, 315; goes to Madrid, 331.
Gravelines, City of, captured by French, i. 318; captured by Spanish, ii. 222; captured by Turenne, 306; annexed to France, 332.
Grisons, their relations with France, i. 104; abandoned by Richelieu, 107.
Guébriant, Marshal of, his victories in Saxony, i. 227; his death and character, 275.
Guienne, Province of, discontents in, ii. 36, 73; sufferings of, 38; joins Condé, 147; mostly lost by insurgents, 238; offers free trade to England, 239; plan for a republic in, 242; becomes peaceful, 245; condition of, during Fronde, 406, 407.
Guise, Henry, Duke of, his duel with Coligny, i. 299, 300; his character, 358, 359; goes to Naples, 361; his reception, 362; made generalissimo, 365; his conduct, 366, 367; receives no aid from France, 369; sends love letter, 370; aristocratic views, 372; leaves Naples, 373; made prisoner, 374; commands expedition against Naples, ii. 259, 260; quarrels with Mademoiselle de Pons, 261; expenses of, 414.
Guitant, ii. 64.
Guiton, Mayor of La Rochelle, i. 123; his fate, 127.
Gustavus Adolphus, makes a treaty with France, i. 156; invades Germany, 157; his progress in Germany, 160; his victory at Breitenfeld, 162; conquers most of Germany, 163; encamps at Nürnberg, 166; is killed at Lutzen, 167.
Gustavus, Charles, King of Sweden, ii. 308, 311.

Hamon, Jean, ii. 482.
Harcourt, Count of, his victories at Casal and Turin, i. 207; defeated at Lerida, 377; repulsed at Cambray, ii. 43; conveys princes to Havre, 87; successful against Condé, 150; rebels against the government, 232, 233; terms made with him, 248, 249.
Haro, Don Luis de, chief minister in Spain, ii. 298; goes to Isle of Pheasants, 323, 325; conferences with Mazarin, 326; asks favors for Condé, 327, 328; signs peace, 332.
Hautefort, Mlle. de, her early life, 192; her favor with Louis XIII., 193; recalled to Court, 282; complains of Mazarin's favor, 294; is dismissed, 296.
Henriette, Marie, Queen of England, finds refuge in France, ii. 286; complains of the acknowledgment of English republic, 289.
Henry the Fourth, influence of his death, i. 5; his plans, 7–9; character, 9; murder of, 9; relations with wife, 11, 12; prosperity under his rule, 26, 27, ii. 382.
Hesdin, Revolt of, ii. 307.
Highways, Condition of, ii. 370, 447, 448.
Hocquincourt, Marshal of, joins Mazarin's army, ii. 157; defeated by Condé, 175; his treasonable conduct, 283, 284, 307.
Holland (see United Provinces).
L' Hôpital, Marshal of, takes part in battle of Rocroi, i. 267–269.
Horses, Price of, ii. 390.
Hotel de Ville, massacre of, ii. 195–199; dinner to Mazarin, 230, 231.
Houdancourt, De la Mothe, Marshal, defeated in Catalonia, i. 278; removed and disgraced, 318; joins the Fronde, ii. 12; defeated in Catalonia, 225.
Huguenots, join with Condé, i. 65; condition of that party, 83; their assemblies, 84; abandoned by nobles, 86, 91; influence of clergy, 87; declare war, 88; make unfavorable peace, 90; comparison with Puritans, 90; failure of party, 92; fresh risings among, 105; terms granted them by Richelieu, 130; their treatment by Mazarin, 274; will not assist Condé, ii. 149; plan for republic, 240, 241, 242; they remain tranquil, 243.
Hunting, ii., 392, 417.

Import duties, ii. 375, 376.
Importants, The, nature of party, i. 246, 255; their overthrow, 293.
Innocent X., elected pope, i. 343; attacks the Barberini, 344; his relations with France, 346, 350; appoints Michel Mazarin cardinal, 353; denounces treaty of Westphalia, 477; his character, ii. 161, 162; friendly to Retz, 164; interferes in Retz's behalf, 219; refuses to accept Retz's resignation, 263; befriends him, 264, 267; his death, 268; condemns Jansenism, 478.
Intemperance, in Germany, ii. 314, 315; in France, 432.
Interest, Rates of, i. 302, 303, 417; ii. 336, 360, 444.
Irish regiment at Bordeaux, ii. 240, 241.
Ithier, Father, ii. 237

James II. of England (see Duke of York).
Jansenism, origin of, ii. 477; five propositions of, 478; zeal of, 480; condemned by French clergy, 489, 490.
Jansenius, Cornelius, ii. 475, 477.
Jardin des Plantes, ii. 453.
Jargé, Marquis of, ii. 41; repulsed by Anne of Austria, 61.
Jeannin, President, retires from office, i. 72; restored, 78.
Jesuits, tenets complained of, i. 13; 47; their influence over Ferdinand II., 148; their activity in Germany, 150; attack Jansenism, ii. 477, 478; attack Port Royal, 484; their position, 485; teachings, 486–488; decline, 489.
Jews, petitions against, i. 62; edicts against, ii. 459, 460.
John IV. declared king of Portugal, i. 205.
John of Austria, Don, ii. 284; his slothfulness, 302; his rashness, 305; his defeat, 306.
Joly, Guy, Assault upon, ii. 54.
Joseph, Father, conduct at Ratisbon, i., 158; disavowed by Richelieu, 159; his death, 202.
Judiciary, French, nature of, i. 379–381, 385; sale of judicial offices, 383; becomes hereditary aristocracy, 384; political power of, 387; corruption among, ii. 281; quarrels for precedence, 420; prices of their offices, 424; character of, 426, 427; fees of, 428.
Juliers, Capture of, i. 18, 19.

King's evil, Touching for, ii. 255, 456.
Knuyt, Plenipotentiary from Holland, i. 334, 335.

La Boulaye, Marquis of, ii. 55.
La Fayette, Mlle. de, her favor with Louis XIII., i. 194; retires to a convent, 196.
Land, Price of, ii. 443, 444.
Languedoc, Province of, insurrection in, i. 138, 140; is mildly treated, 144.
Laon, City of, ii. 396; suffering during the war, 398–403.
La Porte, carries letters for the queen, i. 199; confined in Bastille, 200; is released, 201; made first valet, 282; throws letter in queen's bed, 294.
La Rochelle, City of, position and privileges of, i. 119; besieged by Richelieu, 121; its port closed, 122; distress at, 125; its surrender, 126; faithful to king, ii. 150.
La Valette, Cardinal of, commands army in Germany, i. 169; sent to Lorraine, 177; complains of condition of army, 182.
La Valette, Duke of, his disloyal conduct, i. 185; condemned to death, 186.
Law, Different systems of, in France, i. 379, 381, 386.
Lawyers, early become a separate class, i. 381; incomes of, ii. 428, 429.
League, The Catholic, assists Ferdinand II., i. 149; jealous of Wallenstein, 157.
League of the Rhine, ii. 316, 317.
Le Coigneux, ii. 188.
Lens, Battle of, i. 422, 424.
Leopold, Archduke, defeated at Lens, i. 422; sends envoy to Parliament, ii. 20; invades France, 82, 84; his successes, 222, 223.
Leopold I., Emperor of Germany, his election, ii. 316.
Lerida, City of, captured by Spanish, i. 318; siege of, 377, 378.
Le Tellier, Michel, appointed to office, i. 247; attacked by Mazarin and Condé, ii. 125, 126, 131; removed from office, 132; restored to favor, 161.

Lesdignières, Constable of, restrains revolt, i. 65, 89; abandons his faith and is made constable, 94.
Leyde, Marquis of, commands Spanish at Dunkirk, i. 328; assists in its recapture, ii. 223.
Lights, poor, ii. 391; expensive, 429.
Lionne, Marquis of, attacked by Mazarin and Condé, ii. 125, 126, 131; removed from office, 132; envoy to Rome, 266; his charges against Retz, 271, 272, 274; leaves Rome, 276; endeavors to negotiate peace at Madrid, 299, 319; envoy to Germany, 312; draws renunciation for Maria Theresa, 326.
Lisieux, Bishop of, i. 295.
Literature, Condition of, 460–468.
Lockhart, English minister to France, ii. 298; commands English at battle of Dunes, 305.
Longueville, Duke of, his marriage, i. 290; takes part in conference, 442; sent to Münster, 476; joins the Fronde, ii. 12, 14; arrest of, 65; released, 109; refuses to join Condé, 146, 149.
Longueville, Mme. de, her beauty and early education, i. 289; marries, 290; her journey to Münster, 467; her affection for Rochefoucauld, ii. 11; lodged at Hotel de Ville, 13; flies to Normandy and Holland, 67, 68; conduct at Stenai, 81, 82; her position at Paris, 111; opposes Conti's marriage, 124; desires hostilities, 146; favors Nemours, 179; joins the Ormée, 236; close of her career, 244; protection of Port Royal, 492.
Lorraine, Duchy of, its government, i. 186; is invaded, 187; misery of its inhabitants, 189; remains in possession of the French, 190; condition of, 317; excluded from peace of Westphalia, 469; terms granted, ii. 332, 346; sufferings from war, 403, 404.
Lorraine, Charles, Duke of, joins enemies of Richelieu, i. 186; breaks his treaty, 187; becomes soldier of fortune, 188; marries Princess of Contecroix, 189; comes to Paris, ii. 183; his conduct, 184; deserts his allies, 185; again at Paris, 206; his unpopularity there, 211; leaves France, 211; arrested by the Spanish, 248; at Isle of Pheasants, 332; restored to his duchy, 346.
Lorraine, Cardinal of, marries his cousin and is declared duke, i. 188.
Lorraine, Margaret of, marries Gaston, i. 138.
Loudun, Peace of, i. 66.
Louis XIII., becomes king, i. 10; early years of reign, 20; betrothal of, 23; answers cahiers of States-General, 58–60; marriage of, 64; taste for hunting, 76; plans murder of Concini, 77; his military knowledge, 89; character, 97; forces the pass of Susa, 129; his illness at Lyons, 133; votes for La Valette's death, 186; invades Lorraine, 187; relations with his favorites, 191, 214; his affection for Mlle. de Hautefort, 193; for Mlle. de La Fayette, 196; complains of Richelieu, 197, 198; dedicates France to the Virgin, 201; his relations with Cinq Mars, 214–216; wearies of Cinq Mars, 220; rejoins Richelieu, 223; his declaration as to Cinq Mars, 225; relief at Richelieu's death, 228; announces Mazarin as minister, 230; his religious devotion, 247; declares edict of regency, 249; his illness, 250; death, 251; character, 252; funeral, 253.
Louis XIV., his birth, i. 201; plans for his marriage with Maria Theresa, 333, ii. 299; his majority, 139–141; his education, 142; mode of life, 143; leaves Paris, 150; recalls Mazarin, 156; issues edict of amnesty, 205; refuses to receive delegates, 209; returns to Paris, 212; his treatment of Parliament, 214; orders Retz's arrest, 217; holds Bed of Justice, 227; coronation of, 253–255; his taste for war, 256; receives surrender of Stenai, 257; continues hostile to leaders of Fronde, 277; his unceremonious treatment of Parliament, 279, 280; recognizes English republic, 289; visits Queen Christine, 310; candidate for emperor, 312; proposed marriage with Margaret of Savoy, 317, 321; wishes to marry Marie Mancini, 323–325; marriage with Maria Theresa, 334; his views about treaties, 347.
Louvre, the, Additions to, ii. 445.
Luines, Constable of, made king's falconer, i. 76; plans murder of Concini, 77; made duke and becomes Louis' favorite, 81; hostility

to Huguenots, 87; made constable, 92; his death, 93.
Lützen, Battle of, i. 166.
Luxembourg, Marshal of, ii. 82, 93.
Luxembourg, Palace of, ii. 445.
Lyons, Conference at, ii. 317, 320, 321.

Mademoiselle of Orleans, her character and matrimonial plans, ii. 172, 173; goes to Orleans, 173; rescues the city, 174; opens Paris to Condé's army, 192, 193; tries to check massacre at Hotel de Ville, 198; leaves Paris, 213; income of, 413.
Magdeburg, Destruction of, i. 161.
Magic, Belief in, i. 72.
Maitre, Le, Antoine, ii. 481.
Majesty letter, granted to Bohemia, i. 147
Maldalchini, Olympia (see Olympia).
Malherbe, ii. 463.
Mancini, Hortense, her career, ii. 353–355.
Mancini, Laura, ii. 46; plans for her marriage, 48; her career, 351.
Mancini, Marie: her love affair with Louis XIV., ii. 323, 325; her subsequent career, 352, 353.
Mancini, Marie Anne: her career, ii. 355, 356.
Mancini, Olympe, ii. 46; favorite of Louis XIV., 283; her life and career, 351, 352.
Mancini, Paul, ii. 190, 191.
Mancini, Philip, ii. 349, 350.
Manicamp, Lieutenant-General, ii. 92.
Mantua, Duke of, established in his possessions by treaty, i. 170; his misfortunes, 236; wins Spain, ii. 224; returns to French alliance, 285.
Manufactures, Condition of, ii. 367, 368.
Marcel, Stephen, leads a popular movement, i. 4; States-General under him, 38.
Marchin, Count of, his treason, ii. 147; Condé wishes him made marshal, 209; commands in Guienne, 232; rejoins Condé, 244.
Mareuil, Fontenay, Marquis of, ambassador at Rome, i. 350, 353.
Maria Theresa, Infanta of Spain, her possible inheritance, ii. 318; her looks, 319, 331; betrothed to Louis XIV., 322, 326.
Mardyck, City of, captured and recaptured, i. 325, 326; surrendered to the English, ii. 304.
Marienthal, Defeat at, i. 319.
Marillac, Guard of Seals, his overthrow, i. 135; his death, 141
Marillac, Marshal of, his arrest, i. 136; execution for peculation, 141.
Marle, Sufferings of, during the wars, ii. 397–406.
Marriages, regulation of, ii. 455; dissolution of, 456.
Marseilles, condition of, ii. 369; bad French spoken there, 440.
Martinozzi, Anne Marie, ii. 47; marries Prince of Conti, 252; her life and character, 350.
Martinozzi, Laura, marries Prince of Modena, ii. 285; her administration, 350, 351.
Masaniello, i. 355, 356.
Masks, worn by ladies, ii. 416, 417.
Matthias, Emperor of Germany, succeeds to Rudolph I., 146; his death, 147.
Maubuisson, Abbey of, ii. 474, 475.
Maximilian, Duke of Bavaria, acquires the Palatine, i. 150; opposes Wallenstein, 158; negotiates with France, 473; makes peace, 474; breaks it, 475; retains his electorate, 479.
Mayence, Elector of, ii. 314.
Mazarin, Cardinal: general policy of, i. 2–5; takes part in Italian treaty, 170; succeeds to Richelieu, 230, 243; his birth and pedigree, 232; his early life, 233; taste for gambling 234; his adventures in Spain, 234; serves as an officer, 235; as secretary to the nuncio, 235; his activity in Northern Italy, 237; meets Richelieu, 237; makes peace at Casal, 238; is not a priest, 239; minister to France, 240; is nominated as cardinal, 241; praised by Richelieu, 241; made cardinal, 242; naturalized as a French citizen, 243; desires to retire to Rome, 244; appointed member of council, 249; retained in office by Anne, 262; gains her favor, 263, 264; insists on siege of Thionville, 272; his treatment of the Huguenots, 274, 306; his views on the French government, 280; defends Richelieu's memory and family, 284; his intrigues, 285–288; extracts from his carnets, 286–288; plots against his life, 292; his entire favor with the queen, 292; sends bishops to their dioceses, 295; objects to queen's

excessive religious devotion, 296; his relations with the queen, 297, 298; apprehensive of Parliament, 311; encourages Turenne, 320; desires to annex Spanish Low Countries, 331; willing to abandon Catalonia, 332; plans to marry Louis XIV. to Infanta, 332; views about peace, 336; anger at the Barberini, 344; endeavors to have his brother made cardinal, 345; quarrels with Pope, 346; sends expeditions to Italy, 347, 349; joy at his brother's promotion, 354; views about Naples, 356, 357, 376; distrusts Guise, 360, 368, 374; attacks upon, 406, 441, 442, ii. 1–4, 16–18; favors concessions to Parliament, 408; his views about the Parliament, 436; objects to edict of October, 445; chosen plenipotentiary to Congress at Cologne, 452; reproves Avaux's Catholic zeal, 457; claims France disinterested in Germany, 465; wishes peace made, 476; claims to be poor, ii. 3; desires peace with Fronde, 22, 33; his furniture sold, 19, 25; visits the army, 44; brings his family to Paris, 46; complains of Condé, 58; complains of French women, 68; declares himself a Frondeur, 69; goes to Bordeaux, 76; protects Épernon, 78; hung in effigy, 88; his complaints of Retz, 90; goes to Champagne, 92; unable to thwart his enemies, 98; resolves to yield 105; leaves Paris, 106; releases princes, 109; sends letter to council, 112; goes to Brühl, 113; asks Chavigni's return, 120; complains of his followers, 125, 126; declares his affection for regent, 127; demands his return, 133; edict against, 140; his distress, 152, refuses to go to Rome, 153; flatters Retz, 154; raises an army, 155, 156; enters France, 156; his library sold, 158, 159; he rejoins the court, 160; offended at Retz's elevation, 168; witnesses battle of Faubourg St. Antoine, 189, 193; again retires from office, 204; edicts against, abolished, 205; intrigues at Paris, 207; advises making terms with Condé, 209; insists on Retz's overthrow, 216, 217, 218: delays returning to Paris, 220; negotiates with England, 222, 223; assists in campaign in Champagne, 227; returns to Paris, 228; his power and popularity, 229; dinner to him at Hotel de Ville, 230, 231; desires to marry his niece to Candale, 236; presses on the campaign, 247; obtains Lorraine's army, 248; takes several governments, 249; management of property, 250; conduct at Arras, 258; sends Guise to Naples, 260; his proceedings against Retz, 265, 266, 271; his claims as to the royal authority, 275; recalls Lionne, 276; conciliates Parliament, 280, 281; his negotiations with England and Cromwell, 285, 286, 287, 288; his letters to Cromwell, 289, 291; his offers for treaty, 292, 294; conduct as to the Vaudois, 296; obtains treaty with England, 297; does not wish an English ambassador, 298; refuses to grant Condé his governments, 299; makes further treaty with England, 301; delays in carrying out treaty with English, 303; advises battle of Dunes, 305; his policy too lenient, 307; his intrigues in Germany, 312–316; organizes League of the Rhine, 316; his views as to Spanish marriage, 319, 321; objects to his niece marrying Louis, 324, 325; goes to Isle of Pheasants, 326; his negotiations there, 327–330; industry, 331; signs peace, 332; his views, 333, 334; his greed, 341; conduct as to Fouquet, 341–343; his foreign policy, 344–346; health fails, 347; death, 348; fortune, 348; will, 349; makes Duke of Mazarin his heir, 350; amounts of money drawn by him, 362; his palace, 442; his library, 443.

Mazarinades, Numbers of, i. 231.

Mazarin, Duke of, becomes Mazarin's heir, ii. 349, 354; his vagaries, 354, 355.

Mazarin, Michel, intrigues at conclave, i. 344; at Rome, 345, 350; made cardinal, 353; viceroy of Catalonia, 354.

Meals, Hours for, ii. 429, 430.

Meat, price of, ii. 177, 390; little eaten, 391.

Medici, Mary de, becomes regent, i. 10; appearance of, 10; character, 11; favors Spanish marriages, 23; luxury under, 26; orders Condé's arrest, 70; confined at Blois, 81;

escapes, 82 ; favors Richelieu, 96 ; endeavors to overthrow Richelieu, 134 ; goes into exile, 137 ; her illness at Cologne 223 ; her death, 224 ; her burial, 246.
Meilleraie, La, Marshal of, besieges Perpignan, i. 220 ; appointed superintendent, 416 ; presents statement, 443 ; besieges Bordeaux, ii. 78 ; guards Retz carelessly, 264.
Mello, Don Francisco de, commands the Spanish at Rocroi, i. 268.
Menehould, Sainte, Peace of, i. 28.
Mercœur, Duke of, to marry Laura Mancini, ii. 48 ; his marriage, 230 ; made governor of Provence, 231 ; his subsequent career, 351.
Mercy, General, commands Bavarians at Freiburg, i. 315 ; his victory at Marienthal, 319 ; killed at Nordlingen, 321.
Mesmes, President, opposes the court, i. 403 ; opposes Spanish alliance, ii. 21 ; assists in treaty of Ruel, 25, 26.
Miossens, Count of, ii. 11, 65.
Miron, Provost of Merchants, Speech of, i. 54, 55.
Modena, Duke of, becomes ally of France, ii. 285.
Molé, President, checks the Parliament, i. 309 ; complains of amount of taxes, 398 ; his endeavors for the government, 420 ; his conduct during the barricades, 434, 435 ; assists in treaty of Ruel, ii. 25 ; his courage, 28 ; accusations against, 58 ; presents remonstrances for Condé's release, 99 ; made Guard of Seals, 122 ; is removed, 125 ; receives the seals again, 144 ; quiets a riot, 157
Molière, ——, patronized by Fouquet, ii. 340 ; plays before Mazarin, 347 ; his successes, 435 ; his plays, 467.
Monaco, Prince of, places himself under the protection of France, i. 211.
Monaldeschi, Count of, his murder, ii. 310.
Money, Relative value of, ii. 371.
Monsieur (see Duke of Orleans).
Montbazon, Mme. de, leader of Importants, i. 289 ; quarrels with the Condés, 290 ; wishes Mazarin murdered, 291 ; retires from Paris, 291 ; character of, ii. 60, 61 ; joins alliance against Mazarin, 101 ; banished from Paris, 214.
Montmorenci, Duke of, joins insurrection under Gaston, i. 139 ; taken prisoner, 140 ; his family, 142 ; his power and popularity, 142 ; his trial and execution, 143.
Montpelier, Peace of, i. 90.
Moret, Count of, killed at Castelnaudary, i. 140.
Münster, i. 454, 455, 477.
Mutton, Price of, ii. 390.
Muze Historique, ii. 437.

Naples, revolt at, i. 355 ; asks Guise as leader, 359, 361 ; condition of, 362, 364, 371 ; thrown open to the Spanish, 373 ; lost to the French, 375 ; expedition against, ii. 259–261.
Naples, Paul of, i. 372.
National debt, Amount of, i. 302, 380, 381.
Navy, Condition of, i. 109 ; ii. 364, 365 ; size of ships, 284.
Nemours, Duke of, his conduct as a general, ii. 171 ; quarrels with Beaufort, 174, 175 ; severely wounded, 191 ; killed in a duel, 201.
Neuburg, Palatine of, one of Possessory Princes, i. 19 ; becomes Catholic, 19 ; spoken of for emperor, ii. 312 ; rescues Julius, 328.
Nevers, Duke of, becomes Duke of Mantua, i. 129.
Newspapers, ii.. 437, 439.
Nobility, French, struggles against king, i. 3, 4, 20 ; character, 21 ; great nobles' vast treasure in Bastille, 24 ; position in States-General, 33 ; delegates from, 41 ; attack third estate, 42, 45 ; dependent on pensions, 46 ; cahiers, 58 ; local power, 63 ; pensions paid them, 76 ; enter the army early, 266 ; quarrel over tabourets, ii, 51 ; assembly of, 114, 116 ; hostile to Parliament, 116 ; do not hold the important offices, 359 ; violences of, 395, 396 ; number of, 411 ; income and expenses of, 412–414 ; extravagance of, 414, 415 ; customs of, 417, 419, 420 ; education of, 421 ; loss of power by, 422, 423 ; of robe, 427, 428 ; change in residences, 441 ; children enter the Church, 470, 471.
Nordlingen, Battle of, i. 321.
Normandy, Province of, insurrection in, i. 304, 305 ; joins the Fronde, ii. 13 ; disturbances in, 35, 38 ; desires quiet, 67, 71 ; local States abolished, 374 ; proportion of taille, 375 ; suffering in, 404, 405, 408.
Notables, Assembly of called by

Richelieu, i. 108 ; pay of members, 111.
Nôtre Dame, Cathedral of, first States-General meet there, i. 32, 424, 425.
Noyers, De, his favor and disgrace, i. 247.

Oats, Price of, ii. 389.
Olivarez, Count of, favorite of Philip III., i. 99 ; oppresses Catalonia, 206 ; his overthrow, 279.
Olympia, Donna, her influence over Innocent X , i. 353, ii. 161 ; her corruption, 162.
Opera, Italian, ii. 433.
Orange, Prince of, commands the allies, i. 176 ; writes in behalf of Richelieu, 227 (note) ; becomes imbecile, 334.
Orange, Princess of, bribed by the Spanish, i. 334.
Orbitello, Expedition to, i. 347, 348.
Orleans, City of, rescued by Mademoiselle, ii. 172–175.
Orleans, Gaston, Duke of, marries Mlle. Montpensier, i. 117 ; flees to Lorraine, 137 ; marries Margaret of Lorraine, 138 ; leads an insurrection, 139 ; submits to the king, 141 ; retreats to Brussels, 144 ; plots against Richelieu, 180 ; intrigues with Cinq Mars, 217 ; signs treaty with Spain, 218 ; asks for pardon, 222 ; betrays his associates, 223 ; gives evidence against Cinq Mars and De Thon, 226 ; edict against his holding office, 248 ; appointed lieutenant-general, 249, 261 ; made governor of Languedoc, 282 ; commands in Low Countries, 318, 325 ; takes part in conference, 442 ; abandons La Rivière, ii. 63 ; attempts to make peace, 84 ; his negotiations about the princes, 86 ; joins alliance against Mazarin, 101 ; speaks in Parliament, 102 ; asks for States-General, 116, 117 ; quarrels with Condé, 123 ; his vacillations, 135, 149 ; joins Condé, 168 ; afraid to relieve Condé, 192 ; his conduct at massacre of Hotel de Ville, 195, 198 ; made lieutenant-general, 200 ; appoints a council of state, 201 ; alarmed at his position, 210–212 ; retires to Blois, 213 ; his despicable character, 213 ; income of, 413.
Ormée, The, its rise and character, ii. 234 ; controls Bordeaux, 235 ; supported by Condé, 236 ; violence of, 238 ; opposes peace, 240, 241 ; its overthrow, 244.
Ornann, Marshal of, his arrest, i. 116 ; dies in prison, 117.
Osnabrück, i. 454, 455, 476, 477.
Oxenstiern, Chancellor, becomes leader of the allies, i. 168.
Oxenstiern, Baron of, i. 459, 465.

Palais Royal, given by Richelieu to the king, i. 229.
Palatinate, The, conquered by Ferdinand II., i. 150 ; how affected by treaty of Westphalia, 479 ; improved condition of, ii. 313.
Palatine, Charles, elector, receives eighth Electorate, i. 479 ; in the pay of France, ii. 313, 315.
Pamfili palace, ii. 162.
Paris, City of, election of deputies from, i. 35, 41 ; few relations with provinces, 59 ; reception of king at, 64 ; in danger of capture, 179 ; tax on new buildings, 307 ; forced loan upon, 308 ; streets of, 427, ii. 447, 448 ; excitement at Broussel's arrest, 428 ; condition of, ii. 8, 9 ; enthusiastic over king's return, 44 ; in danger of attack, 83 ; weary of the Fronde, 138, 157 ; suffering at, 177, 178 ; received Condé's army, 193, 194 ; feeling against Condé, 199 ; change of feeling, 207, 209 ; asks the king's return, 210, 212 ; population of, 383, 384 ; changes in, 440, 441 ; price of land, 443, 444 ; size of, 444 ; robbers in, 448 ; appearance of, 449 ; bridges, 450.
Parliaments, Different French, i. 385.
Parliament of Guienne, quarrels with Ormée, ii. 235 ; its conduct towards the government, 236 ; removed to Agen, 245.
Parliament of Normandy ; punishment imposed upon it, i. 305 ; prosecutes for witchcraft, ii. 459.
Parliament of Paris, quarrels with Épernon, i. 50 ; petitions against abuses in state, 62–64 ; declares regency, 257, 261 ; claims its officers need no confirmation, 258 ; protests against the Toisé, 308 ; discontent in, 310, 312 ; increased popularity, 315 ; its origin, 382 ; its jurisdiction, 383 ; number of members, 386 ; value of officers, 386 ; right of registration, 387 ; political power, 389, 390 ; repressed by Richelieu, 390 ; op-

poses new edicts, 396–398; desires conference in Chamber of St. Louis, 400, 404, 405; its part in the Fronde, 410, 411; considers resolutions of Chamber of St. Louis, 415; further demands of, 418, 420; its conduct during the barricades, 433–435; foregoes its vacation, 436; asks for conference, 440; demands for reformation, 442–444; its success, 447; its influence in the Fronde, ii. 8; acts as executive body, 15; issues proclamation against Mazarin, 17; confiscates property, 19; receives envoy from Spain, 20; sends deputies to Ruel, 22; negotiates for Bordeaux, 75, 77, 79; demands Condé's release, 97, 98; compared to English Parliament, 103; demands Mazarin's retirement, 104; resolution against Mazarin, 107; opposed to States-General, 115; adopts edict against cardinals, 118–120; registers edict against Condé, 157; puts price on Mazarin's head and sells his library, 158, 159; vacillates in policy, 178, 181; disturbed by the mob, 187, 189; calls general assembly, 195; many judges leave Paris, 199; chooses Orleans as lieutenant-general, 200; its edicts revoked, 205; its power restricted, 214, 215, 228; opposes stamp duty, 279; their opposition overcome, 281; opposes depreciation of coinage, 300, 301.

Parliament of Provence, Discontents in, ii. 36.

Pascal, Blaise, his writings, i. 465; attacks Jesuits, 484–488.

Patin, Guy, ii. 457, 468.

Pau, plenipotentiary from Holland, i. 324, 325.

Paul, St. Vincent de, his charities in Lorraine, i. 189; exhorts the queen, 295; his charitable labors, ii. 400, 470.

Paulette, nature of duty, i. 43; abolition demanded and agreed to, 43, 44, 46; restored, 88: value and renewal of, 399.

Pays d' États, ii. 374, 375.

Peas, favorite vegetable, ii. 431.

Pegnaranda, Count of, i. 468.

Pensions, i. 16, ii. 413, 14.

Pheasants, Isle of, ii. 323, 325, 326.

Philip III. of Spain, his death, i. 99.

Philip IV. of Spain, his apathy, ii, 298; family, 319.

Philipsburg ceded to France, i. 468.

Picardy, cruelties of soldiers in, ii. 38; condition during the wars, 405, 406.

Pimentel, ii. 320, 321.

Piombino, capture of, i. 349, 350; recaptured by the Spanish, ii. 85.

Pirates, ravages by, i. 109, ii. 368, 369; of Dunkirk, 327.

Place Royale, i. 299, 300.

Plessis, Morney, does not join revolt, i. 65.

Poland, its ambassadors at Paris, i. 351; display among its nobles, 351, 352.

Pomerania, Western, granted to Sweden, i. 478.

Pons, Mlle. de, lady-love of Duke of Guise, i. 358, 370; her lawsuit with him, ii. 261.

Pons, Mme. de, ii. 50; marries Duke of Richelieu, 62.

Pontoise, Parliament of, ii. 202; asks Mazarin's retirement, 203; recalled to Paris, 214.

Port Royal, friendly to Retz, ii. 277; literary influence of, 465; monastery of, 471; its reformation, 472, 473; its zeal, 475; defends Jansenius, 479; recluses at, 481; schools of, 483; literature of, 484; miracles at, 490; persecutions of 491; its dissolution, 492.

Porto Longone, capture of, i. 349; recaptured by the Spanish, ii. 85.

Portugal, revolts against Spain, i. 204; abandoned by Mazarin, ii. 322; not recognized in peace of Pyrenees, 329, 330; assisted by France, 346.

Postage, Rates of, ii. 452.

Posts, under control of government, ii. 452.

Prague, treaty of, i. 173; capture of, 475.

Press, license of, ii. 437.

Princes, Possessory. See Brandenburg and Neuburg.

Princess, Palatine, Anna of Gonzagna, claims to be married to Guise, i. 358; forms alliance against Mazarin, ii. 94, 95.

Prisons, Condition of, ii. 454.

Protestants, complaints of those in Germany, i. 471, 472; terms granted them, 479–481.

Provence, province of, Order restored in, ii. 231.
Provincial Letters, The, ii. 484–488 ; put on index, 489.
Puritans, resemblance to Jansenists, ii. 480.
Pyrenees, Peace of, ii. 323, 327, 329, 330 ; terms of, 332 ; results of, 333, 334.

Rambouillet, Hotel de, ii. 462, 463.
Rantzau, General, taken prisoner, i. 276 ; his drunkenness, 338.
Ratisbon, treaty of, i. 159 ; diet at, 452.
Ravaillac, murders Henry IV., i. 9 ; fortunes and fortitude, 13, 14.
Ré, Island of, attacked by the English, i. 118.
Registration, Right of, i. 387, 388.
Renard, Gardens of, ii. 40, 445, 446.
Renaudot, Theophraste, ii. 438.
Rentes, of Hotel de Ville, i. 302 ; failure to pay, ii. 53 ; amount of, 381 ; fraudulent issues, 382.
Requests, Masters of, new ones created, i. 394 ; suspended from office, 396 ; additional creation of, revoked, 419.
Rethel, Battle of, ii. 93.
Retz, Cardinal of, his early life, i, 428, 429 ; made coadjutor, 430 ; takes part in popular commotions, 431, 432; attacks edict as to loans, ii. 5 ; raises soldiers, 9 ; opposes peace, 29 ; demands nothing for himself, 30 ; assists rentiers, 53 ; accused before Parliament, 56, 58; negotiates with the Court, 63 ; becomes favorite of Orleans, 84 ; asks to be made cardinal, 89 ; is refused, 91 ; speaks for Orleans, 102 ; goes into retirement, 128 ; joins the regent, 129, 133 ; opposes Condé, 136, 169 ; is nearly murdered, 137 ; gains favor with the queen, 139 ; nominated for cardinal, 151 ; will not declare for Mazarin, 154 ; attempt to kidnap him, 155 ; his intrigues at Rome, 161–168 ; is made cardinal, 168 ; heads deputation to the king, 207 ; his vacillating policy, 216 ; his arrest, 217 ; becomes archbishop of Paris, 262 ; agrees to resign, 263 ; escapes from prison, 264 ; goes to Spain, 265 ; reaches Rome, 266 ; defends himself, 267 ; his conduct at conclave, 268, 269 ; receives pallium, 271 ; appoints vicars, 262, 272 ; fears to issue an interdict, 274 ; appoints a grand vicar, 276 ; leaves Rome, 277 ; end of his career, 277, 278 ; expenses of, 414 ; his memoirs, 468.
Rhodes, Mme. de, ii. 95
Richelieu, Cardinal of, general policy, i. 25 ; policy against the nobility, 22 ; spokesman of clergy at States-General, 54 ; receives office from Concini, 72 ; his early life, 73 ; views on taking office, 74 ; defends Concini, 76 ; disgraced, 79 ; reconciled with king, 82 ; is made cardinal, 96 ; becomes chief minister, 97 ; relations with king, 98 ; nature of his administration, 101 ; attacks the Valteline, 105 ; his views on the Huguenots, 106 ; proceeds against the farmers of taxes, 107 ; orders the destruction of useless cattle, 109 ; organizes trading companies, 111 ; appoints superintendents, 113 ; plans invasion of England, 118 ; his exertions at the siege of La Rochelle, 121, 124 ; passes through France in triumph, 131 ; his foreign policy, 132 ; quarrels with Mary de Medici, 133 ; complaints against, 136, 210 ; allies himself with Gustavus Adolphus, 156 ; refuses to ratify treaty of Ratisbon, 159 ; jealous of Gustavus, 168 ; wishes to be Elector of Treves, 170 ; wishes to annex part of Low Countries, 175 ; his courage, 178 ; in danger of assassination, 180 ; interferes in Savoy, 183 ; his anger at La Valette, 185 ; wishes to annex Lorraine, 186, 188 ; makes terms with Duke of Lorraine, 189 ; persuades Louis to dismiss Caussin, 199 ; examines charges against Anne of Austria, 200 ; hires Weimar's army, 203 ; his taste for pleasures and works of art, 208 ; his hours of work, 212 ; his illness, 218 ; discovers Cinq Mars' treaty with Spain, 220 ; meets the king again, 223 ; dictates Louis' conversation with his wife, 224 ; his voyage up the Rhone, 225 ; last journey to Paris, 227 ; his death, 228 ; his will, 229 ; recommends Mazarin as his successor, 230 ; his letters to Mazarin, 240, 241 ; his anger at Enghien, 267 ; his policy with the Parliament, 391 ; sells his bishop-

ric, ii. 424; his palace, 440; his superstition, 456.
Richelieu, Duke of, commands fleet at Naples, i. 367; his marriage, ii. 62.
Richon of Bordeaux, ii. 76.
Rivers, Inundations from, ii. 393, 394.
Rivière, Abbé of, makes terms for Orleans, i. 222; his control over Orleans, 326; nominated for cardinal, 402; nomination revoked, ii. 10; overthrow of, 66.
Robbers. ii. 448, 449, 451.
Rochefoucauld, Duke of, relations with Mme. de Longueville, ii. 11; his demands, 31; takes up arms, 68; engaged in rebellion at Bordeaux, 79–81; his quarrel with Retz, 137; uncertain in his views, 145, 179; jealous of Mme. de Longueville, 179; severely wounded, 191; receives money from Fouquet, 339; his maxims, 468.
Rocroi, battle of, i. 267–271; captured by Condé, ii. 247.
Rohan, Henry, Duke of, joins Condé, i. 66; complains of his party, 89; receives terms, 90; leads another revolt, 105; his letter to Condé, 127; makes treaty with Spain, 128; his death, 204.
Rohan, Duchess of, her fortitude, i. 123.
Rouen, city of, Fine imposed upon, i. 305.
Rouillac, Marquis of, ii. 136.
Rouillon, annexed to France, i. 206; becomes entirely joined to France, 227; ceded by treaty, ii. 332.
Rudolph II., his character, i. 146; grants majesty letter, 147.
Ruel, i. 437; conference at, ii., 23; treaty of, 26, 33.
Russia, makes treaty with France, ii. 345, 369.
Rye, Price of, ii. 389.

Saavedra, Count of, i. 458.
Sacchetti, Cardinal, nuncio at Milan, i. 235; supported for Pope, 341; ii. 268, 269; befriends Chigi, 270.
Saint Chamond, ambassador at Rome, i. 341, 343, 344.
Saint Cyran, Abbé of, imprisonment under Richelieu, i. 245, ii. 476; connection with Port Royal, 476; defends Jansenism, 478, 479.
Saint Denis, captured by Condé and by Turenne, ii. 181–183.
Saint Germain, resort for Court, ii. 6.
Saint Louis, Chamber of, resolution for union of courts there, i. 400; conference there forbidden, 401; allowed, 407; conference at, 409; proposals made there, 412–415.
Saint Megrin, Marquis of, ii. 190.
Saint Simon, Duke of, assists Richelieu, i. 135, 136.
Sales, Saint Francis of, ii. 473, 474.
Salt, Price of, ii. 377, 378.
Salvius, i. 459, 465.
Santinelli, ii. 310.
Savaron, Jean, attacks the paulette and nobility, i. 44.
Savoy, Charles Emmanuel, Duke of, claims Montferrat, i. 236.
Savoy, Charles Emmanuel II., Duke of, persecutes the Vaudois, ii. 295; obliged to desist, 296.
Savoy, Duchess of, protected by Richelieu, i. 183.
Savoy, Margaret of, ii. 318, 321.
Savoy, Thomas, Prince of, surrenders Turin, i. 207; his failure at Orbitello, 347, 348.
Saxe Weimar, Bernard, Duke of, employed by Richelieu, i. 177.
Saxony, Elector of, protected by Gustavus Adolphus, i. 162; abandons Protestants, 173.
Schomberg, Marshal of, commands forces against Montmorenci, i. 140; commands at Casal, 238.
Scudery, Mlle. de, ii. 464, 465.
Secretaries of State, nature of their offices, ii. 357, 358.
Sedan, City of, surrendered to France, i. 226.
Seguier, Chancellor, appointed member of council, i. 249; presides at Bed of Justice, 259, 260; attacked by the mob, 432, 433; surrenders the seals, ii. 69, 144.
Seneterre, La Ferté, Marshal of, captured at Rocroi, i. 269; his blunders, ii. 247, 300.
Seni, astrologer of Wallenstein, i. 154.
Servien, Abel, ambassador at Münster, i. 456; attacked by Mazarin and Condé, ii. 125, 126, 131; removed from office, 132; reconciled with Mazarin and advises vigorous policy, 209; made superintendent of finance, 230.
Sévigné, Mme. de, friend of Fouquet, ii. 339; her letters, 467.
Ships, size of, i. 279, ii. 364, 365; ironclad, ii. 151.
Shoes, Price of, ii. 390.
Sillery, Chancellor of, retires from office, i. 72.
Sirot, Baron of, his valor at Rocroi,

i. 270; taken prisoner, 276; his achievements and death, ii, 171.
Soissons, Count of, absent at coronation, i. 15; hostile to Sully, 15; governor of Normandy, 24; amounts paid him, 76.
Soissons, Count of, son of above, commands in Picardy, i. 179; plots against Richelieu, 180; leads a rebellion, 209; is killed, 210.
Soissons, Countess of (see Olympe Mancini).
Sorbonne, The, receives bequests from Richelieu, i. 230; Richelieu is buried there, 246; believes in witchcraft, 458.
Soubise, Duke of, exiled to England, i. 105.
Spain, condition of, under Olivarez, i. 279; makes peace with United Provinces, 337, 339; character of war with France, 449; hopes for better terms from the Fronde, ii. 42; assists Condé, 147; victories over the French, 222–226; does not assist Guienne, 238, 240, 241; recognizes English republic, 287; endeavors to make treaty with England, 292; refuses peace with France, 299; loses influence in Germany, 315, 317; law of succession, 318; offers peace, 320, 322.
Spinola, Marquis of, commands at Casal, i. 236.
Stamp duty, first imposed in France, ii. 278.
States-General, no demand for, i. 3; do not gain in power, 5; history of, 30–32; representation in, 33, 34; election of delegates, 35, 36; powers wane, 37; defects in, 37–39; States of Paris, 38; States-General of 1614, 40; organization, 42; changes suggested in, 46; quarrels in, 51; cahiers presented, 54–58; hall closed, 58, 59; demand for, ii. 114–117; session abandoned, 139.
Stenai, Siege and capture of, ii. 256, 257.
Stralsund, Siege of, i. 155.
Streets (see highways).
Sugar, Price and consumption of, ii. 391.
Sully, Duke of, flies to Bastille, i. 9; favor under Henry, 14, 15; character, 15; removed from office, 16; wealth of, 17; life at Villebon, 18; elms named after him, 26; unites with Condé, 66.
Superintendents, nature of their office, i. 113; feeling against, 415; offices abolished, 417.
Superintendent of Finance, nature and value of this office, ii. 358, 359.
Superstition, ii. 456, 457.
Sweden, plans for her aggrandizement, i. 170; makes war with Denmark, 319; negotiates about peace, 453–455; terms demanded by, 463, 466, 469, 470; acquires Pomerania, Bremen, and Berden, 478; wars of, ii. 345.

Tabouret, The, ii. 50.
Taille, reduction asked in, i. 44, 46; amount of, 83, 301; reduction in, 419, 443, 444; nature and severity of, ii. 371–373; mode of collecting, in countries of States, 374.
Talon, Omer, Advocate-General, his opinion on Orleans' evidence, i. 226; abuses the ministers, 261; his address before Parliament, 394, 395, speech at king's majority, ii. 141.
Taxes, amount of, i. 301–303; insurrection caused by, 304–307; on baptisms, funerals, and stamps, ii. 278; weight of, 373.
Tea, its use, ii. 431.
Theatres, ii. 431, 435; price of seats, 436.
Thionville, City of, its capture, i. 273.
Third Estate, Representation of, in States-General, 134; deputies and cahiers of, 36, 37, 40; influence of, 40; quarrels with nobility, 44, 51; cahiers, 55–58.
Thirty Years' War, The, its origin, i. 145–147; review of, 447–449; ravages of, 450.
Tilly, captures Magdeburg, i. 161; defeated at Breitenfeld, 162; is mortally wounded, 164.
Tobacco, Consumption of, ii. 391.
Toisé, The, i. 307–309.
Tolls, Number of, ii. 366.
Torture, still used, ii. 453–454.
Toulon, Trade of, ii. 369.
Tour, De la, Family of, i. 277.
Trading companies, Organization of, i. 111.
Transportation, Cost of, ii. 366, 367.
Trautmansdorff, i. 468.
Travel, Time required for, ii. 451, 452.
Trémouille, Duke of. ii. 24.
Trent, Council of, decrees not received, i. 47, 49, 67.

Treves, Elector of, restored, i. 322; purchased by Austria, ii. 314.
Turenne, Marshal of, attracts attention at Turin, i. 208; soldier at fourteen, 266; made marshal and appointed commander of army in Germany, 278; takes part in battle of Freiburg, 316; defeated at Marienthal, 319; conduct at Nordlingen, 321; captures Treves, 322; his army rebels, 324; takes up arms for Fronde, ii. 24; deserted by his army, 32; again in rebellion, 81, 82; defeated at Rethel, 93; refuses to join Condé, 148; commands king's army, 175; besieges Etampes, 185; commands at battle of Faubourg St. Antoine, 189, 193; opposes Lorraine, 206; his campaign in Champagne, 226, 227; commands French army, 246, 247; marches to Arras, 256; raises the siege, 258; defeated at Valenciennes, 300; cuts up his plate to pay the soldiers, 303; his victory at the Dunes, 304, 305; his further successes, 306; made Marshal-General, 335.
Turin, Treaty of, i. 240.

Ulm, Treaty of, i. 323.
United Provinces of the Netherlands, alliance with France, i. 175; slack in their assistance, 325; jealous of France, 330, 334; make peace with Spain, 337, 339; make further treaty with France, 456; their relations with England, ii. 285, 290, 292.
University of Paris, ii. 450, 452.
Urban VIII., sends embassy to Milan, i. 235; his character, 340, 341; his endeavors for peace, 451.
Usorio, Don, loses Bourg, ii. 241.

Valençay, Bailly of, minister at Rome, ii. 164, 165, 168.
Valenciennes, Siege of, ii. 299, 300.
Valteline, The, rebels against the Grisons, i. 104; peace in the, 106.
Vauban, Marshal of, ii. 257.
Vaudois, The, persecution of, ii. 295, 296.
Vautier thrown into the Bastille, i. 137.
Veal, Price of, ii. 390.
Vendôme, Duke of, leaves Court, i. 27; cruelties of his soldiers, 29; again in revolt, 65; amounts paid him, 76; returns from England, 245; his demands, 284, 287; retires to Italy, 294; commands fleet at Bordeaux, ii. 238, 240; enters Bordeaux, 245.
Venice receives aid from France, ii. 345.
Vieuville, La, Duke of, head of the government, i. 97; convicted of fraud, 107; made superintendent of finances, ii. 144.
Vigean, Mlle. du, ii. 190.
Vilars, Leader of Ormée, ii. 234; his treachery, 237; favors Spain, 241; escapes from Bordeaux. 245.
Villeroy, Secretary of State, retires from office, i. 72; restored to office, 78.
Viole, President, his address in Parliament, i. 440.
Vitry, Marshal of, assassinates Concini, i. 78; made marshal, 80; released from imprisonment, 245.
Voiture, Vincent, ii. 464.
Volmar, Dr. i. 458, 464.

Wages, of soldiers, ii. 363; of laborers, 385; of artisans and domestic servants, 386; purchasing power of. 390.
Wallenstein, Duke of, raises an army for the emperor, i., 152; his character, 154; his successes, 155; is removed from command, 158; lives in great state, 159; again assumes command, 164; marches to Nürnberg, 166; his plots, 171; his murder, 173.
Weimar, Duke of, captures Brisach, his ambitions and death, i. 203.
Wert, John de, invades Picardy, i. 178; his victory at Dütlingen, 276; prisoner in France, ii. 476.
Westphalia, Treaty of, condemned by Pope, i, 477; signed, 477; terms of, 478–482; results of, 482; criticism upon, ii. 1; ratification of, 42.
Wheat, price of, ii. 15, 177, 387–389; consumption of, 391.
Witchcraft, Prosecutions for, ii. 457–459.
Wladislas, King of Poland, marries Marie of Gonzagna, i. 351, 352.
Wurtemburg, condition during Thirty Years' War, i. 450.

York, Duke of, his gallant service in French army, ii. 258; approves Mazarin's conduct, 297; marries grand niece of Mazarin, 351.

A HISTORY OF THE THIRTY YEARS' WAR. By ANTON GINDELY, Professor of German History in the University of Prague. Translated by ANDREW TEN BROOK, recently Professor of Mental Philosophy in the University of Michigan. Second Edition. Two volumes, octavo, with maps and illustrations . . . $4 00

This most important period of European History, a right understanding of which is essential to the proper comprehension of Europe to-day, has long waited for an historian. The work of Schiller, while thoroughly readable, was written without any special historical preparation, and at a time when the collections of government archives were not accessible. The little handbook of Gardiner is a most admirable summary, but is too condensed for general reading. It is believed that the present work, which has been prepared by an historian of the highest position and authority, and while thoroughly trustworthy for the purposes of the scholar, is full of interest for the general reader, will meet all the requirements, and will remain the authority on the subject.

"May safely be pronounced better than the best."—*Dis. of Christ*, Cincinnati.

"His portraitures are vividly drawn, and his battle scenes are pictured with great realistic power."—*Zion's Herald.*

"The clear style of the translation makes the reading of the book not only easy but delightful."—*Bulletin*, Philadelphia.

"The translator has not only performed his task in a masterly manner, but by his presentation of this admirable work to English readers, has placed them under a debt of obligation."—*Portland Press.*

"Prof. Gindely has achieved true success in the historical line; he has a real genius for such labors."—*Post*, Hartford.

"Wonderfully well drawn."—*Advocate*, Cincinnati.

"It will doubtless take its place at once as the work of standard authority on the subject."—*Critic and Good Literature.*

"Beyond all question the best history of the Thirty Years' War yet published."—*Phila. Item.*

"Indispensable to the student. For the general reader it is one of the most picturesque in history."—*Hartford Courant.*

"Unquestionably the best history of the Thirty Years' War that has ever been written."—*Baltimore American.*

"Must take a high and permanent place in historical literature."—*Brooklyn Eagle.*

"It is not the least of the services to the cause of right thinking that has at last given us a history of this period which bids fair to bring the two lines (scholarly and popular thought) together.

"It would be hard to name among recent works a more overwhelming indictment of the policy and methods of imperial Jesuitry—a more satisfactory statement of what the Roman Papacy owes to the art and devotion of the Society of Jesus; nor, we may add, a more thorough exposure of the Macaulay romance, that the Reformation in its spread followed the Saxon and Northern races, and proved unacceptable to people of Romanic descent."—*N. Y. Independent.*

"He writes with the calmness of a philosopher and the correctness of a scholar, and the work will take rank with the best histories of modern times."—*Harrisburg Telegram.*

A Companion to Gindely's Thirty Years' War.

LIFE AND TIMES OF GUSTAVUS ADOLPHUS. By the Hon. JOHN L. STEVENS, LL.D., recently United States Minister to Stockholm. 8vo, with new portrait engraved on steel . $2 50

"Mr. Stevens' work shows great research, and is composed in that broader method in keeping with the later demands of historical writing. The style is excellent, and the author is singularly free from partisanship. As the period Mr. Stevens describes was full of heroic devotion, 'The History of Gustavus Adolphus' is not alone singularly interesting, but may be trusted as explaining the consolidation of Protestantism in the north of Europe."—*N. Y. Times.*

"It would be difficult to speak too kindly of Mr. John L. Stevens' admirable 'History of Gustavus Adolphus,' which is published simultaneously in London and New York by G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS. * * * It is not too much to say that Mr. Stevens' book is at once more artistic in its conception, and will most likely prove more acceptable to the average modern English and American, reader, than any previous works on this subject."—*Philadelphia Times.*

"It is a well-constructed historical biography, a useful apparatus for the easy study of European events of the seventeenth century. We find in Mr. Stevens' pages a clear conception of Gustavus' character, strongly and impressively represented. * * * His book is fresh, vivid, and interesting. Mr. Stevens' style is generally careful, neat, and forcible. We do not know of any English life of Gustavus Adolphus which approaches this in fulness; and it is picturesque and readable, while always dignified."—*Boston Literary World.*

"The story of the life of Gustavus Adolphus has been often told, but so romantic is it in its elements, so thrilling in action, and so admirable in lofty qualities, that it will bear re-telling almost without end. A new version of marked ability and attractiveness comes to us from the pen of Hon. John L. Stevens, late United States Minister at Stockholm. It fills an octavo volume of four hundred and twenty-seven pages, but it seems not a page too long, thanks to the varied interest of incident and the charm of style."—*N. Y. Home Journal.*

"Mr. Stevens is possessed of unusual abilities for the preparation of such a work as this. An able writer, with a mind trained in the school of practical, political, and diplomatic affairs, and enriched and strengthened by close study of books and keen observation of men, having had six years' service at the Swedish Court as United States Minister, the very theatre on which the memorable deeds of Gustavus Adolphus were wrought, his work shows the master-hand in every page."—*Kennebec Journal.*

"This new biography of Gustavus Adolphus the Great is a valuable contribution to history. * * * Mr. Stevens has grouped the events of European history during the lifetime of Gustavus Adolphus in a masterly manner. So much of the history and issues of the Thirty Years' War as was included in the relations which the Swedish hero bore to its events, is clearly and perspicuously described. Ample justice is done in the pages of the book also to Wallenstein, and the whole story is clothed with graces of style and is inspired with the interest which attaches to fiction."—*Chicago Evening Journal.*

"Mr. Stevens writes with a vigor and ease which make all his pages delightfully entertaining, and he works up with excellent effect those dramatic situations which naturally belong to the history of such moving times, and which lend their own form and color to occasional passages of the book. * * * The book is a noteworthy addition to biographical history, for which a vacant place has been waiting upon library shelves."—*Minneapolis Tribune.*

A History of the Thirty Years' War. By ANTON GINDELY, Professor of German History in the University of Prague. Translated by ANDREW TEN BROOK, recently Professor of Mental Philosophy in the University of Michigan. With twenty-eight illustrations and two maps. With an introductory and a concluding chapter by the Translator. Two volumes, octavo, pp. xvi. + 456, vi. + 454 . . . $4 00

"Indispensable to the student. For the general reader it is one of the most picturesque in history."—*Hartford Courant.*

"Unquestionably the best history of the Thirty Years' War that has ever been written."—*Baltimore American.*

A History of American Literature. By MOSES COIT TYLER, Professor of American History and Literature in Cornell University. Bradstreet edition. Vols. I. and II., comprising the period 1607–1765. Large octavo, pp. xx. + 292, xi. + 330, handsomely bound in cloth extra, gilt tops 6 00

Half calf extra 11 00

Agawam edition, 2 vols. in one, octavo, half bound in leather . 3 00

Half calf 5 00

"It is not only written in a style of exceptional grace, but it is the first of most thorough research, and consequently it throws light into a great number of corners that hitherto have been very obscure."—Prest. C. K. ADAMS.

Prose Masterpieces from Modern Essayists. Comprising single specimen essays (each selection is *unmutilated* and *entire*) from Irving, Leigh Hunt, Lamb, De Quincey, Landor, Sydney Smith, Thackeray, Emerson, Arnold, Morley, Helps, Kingsley, Curtis, Lowell, Carlyle, Macaulay, Froude, Freeman, Gladstone, Newman, Leslie Stephen. Compiled by G. H. PUTNAM.

Three volumes, 16mo, cloth 3 75

The same, in extra cloth, gilt tops 4 50

The same in flexible imitation seal binding and case, round corners, red edges 10 00

The same, large-paper edition, octavo, with portraits, cloth extra, gilt tops, rough edges 7 50

"Three charming little volumes, showing admirable judgment on the part of the editor."—*Chicago Tribune.*

"A most admirable collection, which presents not only specimens of the best English style, but the methods of thought and characteristic modes of expression of the several writers."—*Magazine of American History.*

France under Mazarin. By JAMES BRECK PERKINS. With a Sketch of the Administration of Richelieu. With photogravure portraits of Mazarin, Richelieu, Louis XIII., and Condé. Two volumes, octavo $5 00

"It is interesting, it is suggestive, it is trustworthy, and in all essentials it is creditable. It can be recommended as a solid, conscientious, thoroughly worked-out book. . . . Its permanent value is increased by a good index."—*N. Y. Tribune.*

The Peace of Utrecht. By JAMES W. GERARD. An Historical Review of the Great Treaty of 1713–14, and of the Principal Events of the War of the Spanish Succession. With Maps. Octavo, cloth, bevelled boards, gilt tops, uncut edges, pp. xv. + 420 . . . . 3 00

"Mr. Gerard has opened up a mine of historical wealth which will be a revelation to many who have been accustomed to regard themselves as thoroughly acquainted with the subject."—*Detroit Free Press.*

English Thought in the Eighteenth Century. By LESLIE STEPHEN, Author of "Hours in a Library," etc., etc. Second and revised edition. Two volumes, large octavo, pp. xv. + 466, xi. + 469 . 8 00

"A work of research and deliberation, every way worthy of the author's reputation. Conscientious, thoughtful, abounding in ripe reflection, and in judgment tempered and weighed by experience. We feel we have in our hands a book which it is worth while to read. . . . It is little to say these volumes are the most complete survey we have of our eighteenth-century literature."—*London Academy.*

On English Literature in the Reign of Victoria, with a Glance at the Past. By HENRY MORLEY, Professor of English Literature in the University of London. With *fac-similes* of the signatures of 250 of the authors referred to.

Popular edition, square 16mo, pp. xl. + 416 75

Library edition, crown octavo, cloth extra, pp. xl. + 361 . 2 00

"This thoroughly excellent work presents a comprehensive survey of the literature from the time of Cædmon, through the reigns of Elizabeth and Anne, down to the reign of Queen Victoria. . . . It is a book teachers and students of literature will find not only exceedingly instructive, but helpful in their work as educators. It should be in every well-chosen library."—*New England Journal of Education.*

A History of English Prose Fiction. BY BAYARD TUCKERMAN. From Sir Edward Malory to George Eliot.

Crown octavo, pp. 331 . . . . . 1 75

"It has the merit of brevity, and gives an intelligible and useful review of the development of English prose fiction."—*Independent.*

Date Due

JUN. 1 0 1983

STORAGE

PRINTED IN U. S. A.

Perkins, James B
France under Mazarin

DC
123
P44
vol.2

88173

Date	Issued to
MAR 10 1967	
JUN 10 1969	STORAGE

Perkins, James B
France under Mazarin

DC
123
P44
vol.2

88173

INTERNET